

ALEXANDER MARX

JUBILEE VOLUME



Alexander Marx



# ALEXANDER MARX

## / JUBILEE VOLUME /

ON THE OCCASION OF HIS SEVENTIETH BIRTHDAY

BM

40

A434

1950

V.1

ENGLISH SECTION



NEW YORK, 1950

THE JEWISH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF AMERICA

Published with a subvention of the Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation

Theology Library  
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY  
AT CLAREMONT  
California

Copyright 1950 by  
THE JEWISH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF AMERICA

PRINTED IN  
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
PRESS OF THE JEWISH PUBLICATION SOCIETY  
PHILADELPHIA, PENNA.

## FOREWORD

At a meeting held in March 1947 the executive committee of the American Academy for Jewish Research voted to publish a Jubilee Volume on the occasion of the seventieth birthday of Doctor Alexander Marx as a token of its love and admiration for the eminent scholar, builder of the greatest Jewish library, promoter of Jewish scholarship in America and abroad, and one of the founders and first presidents of the Academy.

The President of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, Professor Louis Finkelstein, a member of the executive committee of the Academy, requested the privilege of publishing the volume under the sponsorship and at the expense of the Seminary as an expression of esteem by the Faculties for the immense achievements and contributions to Jewish learning of Professor Marx. The officers of the Academy reluctantly agreed to cede the honor of publishing the volume to the Seminary.

The editor invited a number of outstanding scholars here and abroad, all close personal friends of Doctor Marx, to contribute to the volume. The replies to the invitation are represented in these two volumes. It is a matter of deep regret that ill health prevented Professor Louis Ginzberg, one of the closest friends of Professor Marx, from participating in these volumes. We hope that he will soon be able to publish a separate article in honor of the renowned scholar.

The scholarly activity of Doctor Marx was mainly concentrated on the domains of History, Bibliography and Text-criticism. For this reason the contributors considered it fit to deal primarily with these subjects.

It goes without saying that the responsibility for the articles rests wholly with their authors. The notes and additions of the Editor (in the Hebrew volume) were inserted on the specific requests of the writers.



We are grateful to Mrs. Rebekah Kohut who by a generous contribution on behalf of the Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation made it possible for us to publish these volumes in their present size.

Part of the page proofs of the English volume was read by Prof. H. L. Ginsberg to whom the editor expresses his thanks.

I cannot conclude this Foreword without voicing my appreciation of the excellent work done by the compositors and the proof reader of the Jewish Publication Society Press or without expressing my sincere thanks to its director, Dr. Maurice Jacobs, for his special care in seeing the volume through the press.

For various reasons the publication of these volumes has taken longer than had been anticipated. They are herewith tendered to Doctor Marx on his seventy-second birthday, accompanied by the ardent prayer of his friends and admirers for good health and continuous creative labor for untold years to come.

SAUL LIEBERMAN, *Editor*

February, 1950

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
KOHUT, REBEKAH (New York): Prof. Alexander Marx....	xi
GOLDMAN, SOLOMON (Chicago): The Man of the Book....	1
BIBLIOGRAPHY of the Writings of Prof. Alexander Marx, by BOAZ COHEN .....	35
ALBRIGHT, W. F. (Baltimore): The Judicial Reform of Jehoshaphat .....	61
BARON, SALO W. (New York): Moritz Steinschneider's Contribution to Jewish Historiography.....	83
BICKERMAN, ELIAS J. (New York): Some Notes on the Transmission of the Septuagint.....	149
COHEN, BOAZ (New York): Antichresis in Jewish and Roman Law .....	179
FISCHEL, WALTER J. (San Francisco): The Region of the Persian Gulf and Its Jewish Settlements in Islamic Times.....	203
*FREIMANN, AARON (New York): Jewish Scribes in Medieval Italy.....	231
FRIEDENWALD, HARRY (Baltimore): Themon Judaeus and His Work.....	343
GINSBERG, H. L. (New York): Judah and the Transjordan States from 734 to 582 B. C. E.....	347
GORDIS, ROBERT (New York): Democratic Origins in Ancient Israel — The Biblical 'Ēdah.....	369
HALKIN, A. S. (New York): Ibn 'Aḡnīn's Commentary on the Song of Songs.....	389
KISCH, GUIDO (New York): The Editio Princeps of Pseudo- Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum.....	425

\*Deceased.

	PAGE
MARCUS, JACOB RADER (Cincinnati): A Brief Supplement to the Standard Hebrew Dictionaries of Abbreviations..	447
MARX, MOSES (Cincinnati): On the Date of Appearance of the First Printed Hebrew Books .....	481
NEUMAN, ABRAHAM A. (Philadelphia): Josippon: History and Pietism.....	637
ROTH, CECIL (Oxford): Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Roth Collection.....	503
SCHEIBER, ALEXANDER (Budapest): Piyyutim from the Geniza Collection of David Kauffmann.....	537
SPERBER, ALEXANDER (New York): A New Bible Translation.....	547
TAEUBLER, E. (Cincinnati): Habiru-'Ibhrim.....	581
TORREY, CHARLES C. (New Haven): The Hebrew of the Geniza Sirach.....	585
WOLFSON, H. A. (Cambridge, Mass.): The Veracity of Scripture in Philo, Halevi, Maimonides, and Spinoza. .	603
ZEITLIN, SOLOMON (Philadelphia): A Note on the Principle of Intention in Tannaitic Literature.....	631



# TABLE OF CONTENTS OF THE HEBREW SECTION

	PAGE
ALBECK, CH. (Jerusalem): (The) <i>Halakhoth</i> and (the) <i>Derashoth</i> . . . . .	1
ARZT, M. (New York): Chapters from a Ms. of Midrash Tehillim . . . .	49
ASSAF, S. (Jerusalem): <i>Sefer Pesaḥim</i> by R. Isaac "The Older", R. Tam and other Tosaphists . . . . .	9
BANETH, D. Z. (Jerusalem): Geniza Documents on Jewish Communal Affairs in Egypt . . . . .	75
CASSUTO, U. (Jerusalem): Another Hebrew Inscription from Trani . . .	387
DAVIS, M. (New York): " <i>Haṣofeh ba-areṣ ha-ḥadashah</i> " . . . . .	115
EPSTEIN, J. N. (Jerusalem): An Arabic Translation of the Mishnah . . .	23
FINKELSTEIN, L. (New York): The <i>Halakhoth</i> Applied to Jerusalem . . .	351
*FREIMANN, A. (Jerusalem): The Amount of the <i>Kethubah</i> in Medieval Germany and France . . . . .	371
GREENBERG, S. (New York): Midrash Koheleth Zuṭa . . . . .	103
GUTTMANN, J. (Jerusalem): The Sources of Ḥiwi al-Balkhi . . . . .	95
HESCHEL, A. (New York): Inspiration in the Middle Ages . . . . .	175
HIGGER, M. (New York): <i>Sefer Amarkol</i> . The Halakhoth of Passover . .	143
*KRAUSS, S. (Cambridge, Gt. Britain): The Armies of Bar Kokhba . . .	391
LIEBERMAN, S. (New York): The New Fragments from the Yerushalmi . .	284
LIEBERMAN, S. (New York): The Old Commentators of the Yerushalmi .	287
LOEWINGER, S. (Budapest): New Fragments from the Yerushalmi <i>Pesaḥim</i> ch. 5-7 . . . . .	237
*MARKON, I. (Ramsgate): Solomon b. Mazal Tob . . . . .	321
RIVKIND, I. (New York): Variants in Old Books . . . . .	401
SCHOLEM, G. (Jerusalem): R. Elijah Ha-cohen Ha-itamari and the Sabbathism . . . . .	451
SCHWABE, M. (Jerusalem): The Caesarea Synagogue and Its Inscriptions	433
SONNE, I. (Cincinnati): Excursions into History and Bibliography . . .	209
SPIEGEL, S. (New York): The Legend of Isaac's Slaying and Resurrection . . . . .	471

\*Deceased.



## PROF. ALEXANDER MARX

By REBEKAH KOHUT

For all his great achievement as one of the leading scholars of our times, Alexander Marx at 70 is still as modest and unassuming as the day forty-five years ago when he arrived from Berlin to assume the post of Librarian at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. Like his great teacher, Moritz Steinschneider, he will tell you little about himself, preferring instead to speak of the precious treasures he has gathered from all parts of the world for the Seminary Library. Speak to him of the part he played in the development of the Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation, and he will tell you instead about George Kohut, his lifelong friend.

Dr. Marx came to the Seminary in 1903 when he was 25 years old. The youngest member of the staff, he was made custodian of five thousand books and three manuscripts. Under his firm guidance the Library has grown until today, when he is 70, it contains over one hundred forty thousand books and seven thousand manuscripts. Until last year it also included a Museum of Jewish Ceremonial Objects, one of the finest collections in America. The Museum is now housed in a building of its own with Dr. Stephen S. Kayser as curator.

Dr. Marx came from Germany where his forebears were merchants. His father was president of a bank in Koenigsberg. A learned man, he was also the author of scholarly scientific articles. His mother was a beautiful woman, highly cultured and talented. She wrote poetry and several volumes of her poems were published partly after her death.

One of ten children, Dr. Marx was chosen by his father to become a rabbi. He had started to build a library shortly after his Bar-Mitzvah; he realized, however, then that he would prefer to devote his life to books rather than the rabbinate. Over the

years that private library has grown until it includes more than ten thousand volumes, one of the largest collections of its kind. The books fill his home, crowding the quarters which he and his family occupy, but they dare not move lest the books be disarranged.

As a young man, Alexander Marx attended the Gymnasium at Koenigsberg and then the Rabbiner Seminar and the University of Berlin. In five years he knew every Jewish book and periodical he could find there. In 1895 he graduated from the gymnasium, and shortly afterward he went to Berlin. There he became a disciple of Professor Moritz Steinschneider, cataloguer of the Bodleian Collection at Oxford and originator of new methods for describing Hebrew incunabula.

To complete his studies, Dr. Marx visited the Bodleian Library and Cambridge University in England, where Dr. Solomon Schechter was teaching. In their love of learning and enthusiasm for Hebrew literature they discovered much in common. They soon became fast friends, and when Dr. Schechter was called to New York to become President of the Jewish Theological Seminary, he asked his youthful associate to take the post of Librarian, which was then vacant.

Almost every leading student and writer in Jewish studies has consulted Dr. Marx since then. His study has become the guiding point for hundreds of books based on material available in the Seminary library. He has also encouraged a great deal of study in original sources, especially in the field of the *Responsa*, those compendia of questions and answers on the Law accumulated over centuries of Jewish experience. To him have come inquiries about ancient manuscripts, about incunabula, book-binding, paleography and other specialties in which Dr. Marx is an authority. His knowledge of the contents of the Seminary library is almost beyond belief. He can recall the exact circumstances of the purchase of each item, its author, title page, binding and price. And most important of all, he has made a friend and admirer of almost every man who called upon him for help.

To understand Alexander Marx, one must know something about Moritz Steinschneider, the intellectual giant of Jewish



learning in nineteenth century Germany, for the teacher's influence has been paramount in the pupil's life. His love of languages, his passion for books and ancient Hebrew manuscripts, and his broad humanitarianism were all encouraged by the German master. I know how great that influence was, for I saw it in George Kohut's interest in Arabio-Jewish literature, in bibliography and in other phases of Jewish learning.

Alexander Marx and George Kohut met as students at the Veitel-Heine Ephraim'sche Lehranstalt in Berlin where Steinschneider lectured. The Master was then eighty years old, but he had lost none of the youthful fire, none of the pungent wit and penetrating scholarship that endeared him to all his pupils. In the group with them were such men as Samuel Poznanski, Henry Malter and Paul Rieger. There were also at that time Judah L. Magnes, now President of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem; Rabbi Leo Baeck; and many others who went on to distinguished careers in Judaism. But of them all, it was Professor Marx whom George considered Steinschneider's greatest disciple.

In "Steinschneideriana," which George Kohut wrote for the Abraham S. Freidus Memorial Volume, *Studies in Jewish Bibliography and Related Subjects*, he declared: "To give anything like an acceptable account of the character, personality and achievements of Moritz Steinschneider one must needs be an accomplished scholar in many fields of Jewish and Oriental learning and be gifted with critical insight into the whole domain of human knowledge. Such a commission should be undertaken by some American scholar, who could work in the Steinschneider Library, now in New York, under the eye of the Master's most distinguished pupil, Prof. Alexander Marx, who, more than any other man living, is competent to aid in this fascinating task."

In the years that have passed, Alexander Marx has deservedly earned that accolade. He worked constantly with George to preserve the monumental contributions of Steinschneider to Jewish learning. On the occasion of Steinschneider's eightieth birthday, George Kohut compiled a bibliography of the Master's writings for the *Steinschneider-Festschrift*, published by him and Dr. Samuel Poznanski. Later Professor Marx went over the

*Bibliography*, painstakingly checking errors and omissions and encouraging George to issue a revised and enlarged edition with a subject index. This was an invaluable service for which George expressed his deep appreciation. Professor Marx's own *Collected Writings of Steinschneider*, which he edited with Henry Malter, and his recently published biographic study of Steinschneider in the book called *Essays in Jewish Biography* stand as monuments to the memory of his beloved teacher.

George used to tell of the delightful evenings he and Marx and other "rapt disciples" used to spend with the frail old Steinschneider at his home in the Wallnertheaterstrasse. These young men were Steinschneider's *Lieblingsschüler*; and he used to hold forth to them in his brilliant fashion, a book from his library of treasures always in his hand.

The story of that priceless library deserves a place by itself. Had it not been for a suggestion by one of Steinschneider's distinguished pupils, it might have suffered the fate of other irreplaceable Jewish collections in Germany. This was how it came about.

George returned to Berlin in 1898 and, on visiting his old Master, learned that he was oppressed by financial cares. When George suggested that he be permitted to establish a fund to which all his pupils could subscribe, Steinschneider indignantly rejected anything that smacked of charity. In New York, George discussed this situation with Abraham S. Freidus, another of Steinschneider's admirers and then chief of the Jewish Division of the New York Public Library. How could they help Steinschneider and still avoid offending him? Freidus at last evolved a plan to purchase Steinschneider's library. An appeal was made to Jacob H. Schiff to finance the purchase and that great-hearted man promptly agreed. After lengthy negotiations conducted through George, the library was bought for M10,000. Under the conditions of the sale, it remained in Steinschneider's possession for the rest of his life before its transfer to New York when it was to be turned over to a public Library.

George's interest in the Seminary was a heritage from his father, Alexander Kohut, who was one of its founders. For several years at the beginning of the century, George also

served as the assistant librarian of the Seminary. Thus, as he said regarding the transfer of the Steinschneider Library: "It is no mere coincidence that I who stood in perhaps the closest relation to him should have been the instrument of Providence in initiating and negotiating the sale, and that Alexander Marx, unquestionably his greatest disciple and his most devoted friend, should now be the guardian of the treasure which has come into his keeping."

Steinschneider is perhaps best known as the cataloguer of the Bodleian Collection at Oxford and for his work on Hebrew bibliography and Hebrew writings in Arabic. But the thousands of letters he wrote during his long life also contain a storehouse of information and learning. To collect and publish the great Master's correspondence was a project upon which George and Professor Marx worked for many years. Steinschneider died in 1907 at the age of 91, and the task of collecting and editing his correspondence fell to his faithful secretary and friend Miss Adeline Goldberg. Through the efforts of George, she was persuaded to turn over this valuable collection of letters to the Seminary Library. Eventually, it was hoped, the letters would be edited and published by the Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation.

Working with Professor Marx, George had planned to read a paper on this collection for the annual meeting of the American Academy for Jewish Research, which was to be held in December 1933. In his last visit to Professor Marx at the Seminary, they discussed this paper as well as the Steinschneider correspondence which Fräulein Goldberg had sent them. But his last illness prevented him from completing the paper. The project to publish the letters, however, was carried out by Professor Marx two years later in the memorial volume entitled *Jewish Studies in Memory of George A. Kohut, 1874-1933*, which he edited with Professor Salo W. Baron. Many of the most important Steinschneider letters were included in this volume. Another group of the letters were used in Professor Marx's recent biographical study of his teacher.

Professor Marx has written many essays and reviews on Steinschneider's works. He also delivered the commemorative



address at the memorial meeting held shortly after Steinschneider's death by the *Ohole Shem*, the New York Hebrew Literary Society. Another tribute by Professor Marx was published that year in the *American Hebrew* in the same issue that carried George's sonnet to the memory of Steinschneider. In the years that have passed, he has striven valiantly to keep alive the memory of his great teacher.

This loyalty to his friends is one of the characteristics of Professor Marx that has endeared him to all of us. In spite of the great burden of his work at the Seminary, he has carried on without hesitation the direction of the Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation which George established in 1915. The success of this Foundation in stimulating Jewish scholarship and publishing its results was the great ambition of George's life. And in every step of its development he had the full cooperation of Professor Marx. To my knowledge, he never undertook a project for the Foundation without first consulting him.

The Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation, of which Professor Marx is one of the Trustees, was originally established at Yale University as a publication fund. Under its auspices the Yale University Press has issued many notable works by members of the faculty in the Department of Semitics. Among them are *Early Babylonian Letters from Larsa*, by Henry Frederick Lutz; *The History of the Conquest of Egypt, North Africa and Spain, known as the Futūh Misr of Ibn 'Abd Al-Hakam*, by Charles C. Torrey; *The Arabic original of Ibn Shāhīn's Book of Comfort*, known as *Hibbūr Yaphê* of R. Nissīm b. Ya'aqobh, edited from manuscript by Julian Obermann; *The Hebrew-Arabic dictionary of the Bible*, known as *Kitāb Jāmi' Al-Alfāz (Agrōn)* of David ben Abraham Al-Fāsi the Karaite, by Solomon L. Skoss; and *The Empire of the Amorites and The Origin of Biblical Traditions. Hebrew Legends in Babylonia and Israel. . .*, by Albert T. Clay.

It was in 1912 following a meeting with the late Professor Clay that George decided to donate the greater part of his beloved father's library to Yale. This Library, which George treasured more than his life, contains eight to ten thousand works, mainly titles pertaining to Hebrew literature and learning.

It is especially rich in publications bearing on the history, life and literature of the Jews. Dr. Alexander Kohut, who was an authority on talmudic literature, had gathered together many priceless volumes bearing upon the Talmud, including commentaries and rabbinic works of all periods. There are philological treatises, manuscripts, early prints, important incunabula and books from the early part of the sixteenth century, and many rare volumes covering liturgy and ritual, Cabala and other fascinating branches of Jewish learning.

The Kohut Library, later supplemented by George's Heine collection and a large portion of his private library which he bequeathed to Yale, is now held in the Sterling Library. There in 1933 an exhibit of rare Judaica and Hebraica was arranged with the cooperation of Professor Marx. It was an event that attracted a great many scholars and students.

I can well remember the day on which it was opened. It was spring, and the trip to New Haven with Professor Marx that morning was enlivened by our own high spirits. At the university we met Dr. Andrew Keogh, the Yale librarian; Mr. George Parmly Day, treasurer of the university and former head of the Yale Press; George's dear friend Professor Charles C. Torrey and his family; Professor Schreiber of the Germanic Division, and many other notable scholars. Professor Marx delivered the principal address on this memorable occasion and as he spoke of the many priceless volumes in the Alexander Kohut Library, tears welled up in George's eyes. Later he confessed that this magnificent tribute to his father had made the day the happiest in his life.

The Memorial Publication Fund was followed four years later by the establishment at Yale of the Alexander Kohut Research Fellowship in Semitics on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of Alexander Kohut's death. Made possible by a special gift of \$20,000 and yielding \$1,000 a year, the Fellowship is awarded annually to a post-graduate student for research and study in the field of Oriental and Semitic learning. It was the first to be established in an American college and was held for six years by the late Dr. Etaline Grice. Publication of her monumental work, *Assyrian Name Lists*, under the imprint of



the "Yale Oriental Series" will be made possible by the Kohut Foundation.

A branch of the Kohut Foundation was established at the Jewish Institute of Religion in New York early in the 1920's. The publications sponsored by this branch of the Foundation include several outstanding studies. One of them was a translation of the treatise *Pirke Aboth*, edited with an introduction and commentary by the eminent scholar Canon R. Travers Herford. Another was the two volumes of a *Greek Index to Philo*, prepared by Ioannes Leisegang, issued conjointly by the Institute and the Prussian Academy of Sciences, a rare instance of cooperation in pre-Hitler days between a German Academy and Jewish scholars.

Under the Institute's auspices there also appeared Professor Israel Abrahams' course of three lectures on the *Glory of God*, one of the last works of this extraordinary scholar. George was fond of showing his admiration of scholars by jubilee or memorial volumes. In this he was encouraged by Professor Marx, and after consulting with the latter he edited a volume of *Jewish Studies in Memory of Israel Abrahams by the Faculty and visiting Teachers of the Jewish Institute of Religion*. Publication of this volume by the Press of the Institute was made possible by the Kohut Foundation. Another major work published by the Foundation was the critical variorum text of *The Book of Joshua in Greek*, edited by Professor Max L. Margolis of Dropsie College, a colleague of Professor Marx and co-author with him of the authoritative one-volume *History of the Jewish People*. The Foundation also made possible the publication of a dictionary of the Greek text of Josephus by the late Dr. H. St. John Thackeray, whose work was continued by Professor Ralph Marcus. In this instance as in so many others it fell to the lot of Professor Marx to see the volume through the press after George's death.

These works won the universal acclaim of Christian as well as Jewish scholars all over the world. Kohut Foundations were established in Vienna, Berlin and Budapest in 1922 and 1923, and resulted in the publication of a series of works of immense value to modern Jewish learning. Here again Professor Marx's aid proved invaluable. He served on the International Advisory

Board, composed of a group of representative scholars who administered the Foundation, and on the Committee on Publications, which aided in the selection of literary material to be published.

Some idea of the enormous effort that went into the works sponsored by the Kohut Foundation can be gathered from the story of the publication of *Die Flora der Juden*, by Oberrabbiner Dr. Immanuel Löw of Hungary. This mine of information relating to plants, in Jewish literature represents a feat of stupendous learning. It is likely to remain the standard work in its field for many generations to come. Its publication in five volumes in Vienna and Leipsic covered a period of ten years, from 1924 to 1934, and was completed despite the threatening state of the world at that time and the rise of Hitlerism in Germany. It was to be followed by similar works on animals and stones and Dr. Löw was working on the latter up to his death.

The Vienna branch of the Foundation also brought out two brilliant monographs by the distinguished talmudic scholar Professor V. Aptowitzer, one on the political parties of the Maccabean period as reflected in rabbinic records, and the other on the story of Cain and Abel as related in the Haggada, in the Apochrypha, and in Hellenistic, Christian and Mohammedan writings. Another work that George was particularly proud of was the publication in 1930 of a 560 page reproduction in facsimile of the celebrated *Kaufman Codex of the Mishnah*. A work of art in itself, the volume was issued in a limited edition of two hundred copies. The manuscript, preserved in the National Museum in Budapest, is the oldest punctuated text of the Mishnah, and reproduction made available to scholars all over the world a correct basis for special study.

Professor Marx was a prime mover in this project as well as helping George fulfil another of his life's ambitions, the publication of a supplement to the *Aruch Completum*, an encyclopedic dictionary of the Talmud in eight folio volumes, compiled and published under conditions of great sacrifice by Dr. Alexander Kohut. The noted scholar Professor Samuel Krauss of the Jüdisch-Theologische Lehranstalt, of Vienna, was entrusted with

the task of editing the volume of supplements, which included contributions from such famous men as Immanuel Löw, Bernhard Geiger, David S. Blondheim, Louis Ginzberg, and Benjamin Marmorstein; it was not published until 1937.

Many works of outstanding merit were also produced by the Budapest and Berlin branches of the Kohut Foundation. In a Europe where political turmoil and poverty after the First World War were rife, the Foundation came as a shining beacon to scholars who had persisted in their studies despite impossible conditions. Nazism completed the destruction of Europe as a center of Jewish learning, and in the fires of that holocaust almost all of men and their works were immolated. But in the two decades between the wars, the Kohut Foundation made possible the preservation and dissemination of at least some of the products of the great minds of European Jewry.

Out of the Kohut Foundation at the Budapest Seminary came a volume of Jewish studies dedicated to the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the institution, which included a memoir of Alexander Kohut by Chief Rabbi Dr. Julius Fischer and a bibliography of Dr. Kohut's work by his son George. The volume was edited by Professor Ludwig Blau, rector of the Seminary and a noted scholar.

In Berlin the Kohut Foundation was administered by Professor Ismar Elbogen of the Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums. A monograph on the Aramaic Syntax of the Babylonian Talmud, by Dr. Michael Schlesinger, was the first comprehensive presentation of the subject in any language. One of the greatest Jewish philosophers of our time, Dr. Joseph Klatzkin, who recently passed away in Switzerland, was enabled by a subvention of this branch of the Kohut Foundation to publish three volumes of his monumental thesaurus of Hebrew philosophical terminology. These and many other examples of contemporary Jewish scholarship in all probability would never have seen the light of day — certainly not in their present comprehensive form — had it not been for the Kohut Foundation.

I can remember clearly the day a letter arrived from Vienna telling me that the Nazis had burned the books of the Kohut Foundation there. In my distress I turned to Professor Marx,



who rushed to my home as soon as he received my call. Words cannot describe Professor Marx's grief as he read the letter. Each one of those books was like a treasured friend; the loss was irreparable.

Without the help and unselfish devotion of Professor Marx, I would never have been able to continue the work of the Kohut Foundation. Through his indefatigable efforts, the projects begun by his dear friend George were carried out. Despite his numerous activities, he gave fully of his time and knowledge. Manuscripts had to be prepared for publication. Detailed arrangements had to be entered into with printers, for each volume to be published presented unusual typographical problems. The burden of all the myriad details which beset an editor was shouldered by Professor Marx without a moment's hesitation.

Under his guidance a wide variety of scholarly volumes was published in the years before the Second World War. As part of the Yale Oriental Series, Professor Solomon L. Skoss of Dropsie College prepared an edition of the Hebrew-Arabic dictionary of David Al-Fāsi, a contemporary of Saadia. This work, in two volumes, was edited from manuscripts in the State Public Library in Leningrad and in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. The fourth volume continuing *The Book of Joshua in Greek*, by Professor Margolis, was published post-humously. A volume of essays in commemoration of the eight hundredth anniversary celebration of Maimonides in 1935, edited by Dr. Salo W. Baron, was brought out with the cooperation of the Columbia University Press. In recent years a subvention of the Kohut Foundation enabled the Hebrew University to publish V. Tcherikover's important book on *The Jews in Egypt in the Hellenistic Roman Age in the Light of the Papyri*.

In tribute to the memory of his friend and the founder of the Alexander Kohut Foundations, Professor Marx and Dr. Baron edited and published a volume of *Jewish Studies in Memory of George A. Kohut, 1874-1933*. Fifty eminent scholars contributed to this volume, which also included a bibliography of the writings of George Kohut. His life-long friend, Dr. Stephen S. Wise, contributed a biographical appraisal of his

achievements. Professor Marx also obtained the assistance of Dr. Joshua Bloch, Chief of the Jewish Division of the New York Public Library, to complete George Kohut's unfinished work, *Christian Hebraists*, an anthology of the writings in Hebrew of Christian scholars from Reuchlin to Renan. In accordance with the wishes expressed by George, this volume was to be issued by the Yale University Press as part of the Yale Oriental Series.

It is perhaps characteristic of Professor Marx that in the tribute he wrote to the memory of George Kohut for the editor of the *American Jewish Yearbook*, he omitted almost all mention of his own great influence upon his friend. One of George's absorbing interests was American Jewish history. There is no doubt that he received invaluable assistance in his investigations from his friend, Professor Marx. He could draw on Professor Marx's vast knowledge of Spanish literature for his studies of the activities of the Inquisition on the American continent. And in his work on Ezra Stiles, the great Puritan divine who later became president of Yale, which led in turn to his studies of other Christian scholars who had published their writings in the Hebrew language, Professor Marx was constantly consulted. There was similar cooperation on one of George's last projects, a volume on "Curiosities of Jewish Literature," for which he had gathered a large amount of material.

So much that Professor Marx said about George Kohut in his tribute in the *Yearbook* might in turn be said about him that I cannot resist quoting a brief passage from that article. Professor Marx said:

"Kohut had seen in his youth with what difficulties his father had to contend in order to raise funds for the publication of his great dictionary, and the son wished to save scholars engaged in original research such humiliation, tribulations and agony, and to enable them to publish the results of their investigations free of material care. It must be said, in addition, that several of the most important works of the Kohut Foundation might never have been written but for the inspiration and the enthusiasm for Jewish learning of George Alexander Kohut. Being prevented time and again by ill health from carrying out his own scientific

plans, he took pride in such vicarious contributions to Jewish learning by stimulating and helping others.

"But he wished that all the credit should be given to the memory of his father. For himself, he shunned honor and public recognition. When friends planned to have his efforts recognized by an honorary degree of one of the leading universities, he forbade them to proceed, and Dr. Wise had practically to force on him the honorary degree of Doctor of Hebrew Letters."

With due allowance for the varying circumstances of these two great friends, how true these words would ring if they were said of Professor Marx instead of George Kohut.

In many unobtrusive ways, Professor Marx has shown that selfless loyalty to his friends that is all too rare among men in these unmoral days. Others can speak better than I of his unique contributions to Jewish bibliography and Jewish history and of his efforts to preserve the scattered treasures of Jewish learning. I can speak only of the man I know, the warm personality and the generous heart. Sympathetic almost to a fault, very modest, he is always ready to sacrifice his few duty-free hours in order to help others.

In the last eighteen years he has been a constant source of comfort to me. He has called to inquire after my health at least once each week. In conducting the operations of the Kohut Foundation, he has never undertaken a project or published a book without first consulting me about it, though he knew that I relied entirely upon his opinion.

I remember that whenever George used to run across an interesting bit of information or when plans for a new project of the Foundation began to take shape in his mind, he would always say to me, "Well, I've got to go up and tell Marx about this." Despite his numerous responsibilities, Professor Marx has made it very easy for me to adopt a similar habit of consulting him. I can think of no one better equipped as a man and as a scholar to carry on the work of encouraging Jewish learning begun by George as a tribute to his father. It makes me very happy to leave the Foundation in his care for many more productive years to come.



## THE MAN OF THE BOOK

By SOLOMON GOLDMAN

Jedes Zeitalter, wenn es neue Ideen  
bekommt, bekommt auch neue Augen  
und sieht gar viel Neues in den alten  
Geisteswerken.

Heine

The story of Professor Marx' life is that of a scholar's patient perseverance in his craft. We may say of him, with as good a reason as the Rabbis had said of R. Johanan ben Zakkai and the *Geonim* of Rav ימיו כל ימיו בטלה כל ימיו, 'that he had never, in all his days, engaged in idle conversation.' Nothing that failed to tempt the memory to marking or remembering or urge the brain to thought, had any purchase on his imagination. The desire for knowledge alone lured him and held him a willing and obedient servant in its power. He was first learning to read when he found the fascination of books irresistible, and he was still a very young man when one of his teachers observed of him that he could have browsed in a library for days at a time, even if he had been locked up there and restricted to a diet of bread and water. What others looked upon as toil and dreary vistas of boredom was to him the pleasure of his life. Research was nourishment; palaeography, bibliography, typography, history, were the call of kin; the rustling of a manuscript was sweet music; the colophon of an incunabulum was superb beauty; the collecting of books was thrilling adventure; the name of the immortal Steinschneider was an awe-inspiring memory. From the time his sainted father taught him his first *Aleph* up to the present, when the scholarly world is honoring him on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, the story of his life has been that of the romance of a craft.



Though such a story is no rarity in the annals of a people whose lullabies extolled the supremacy of Torah, and whose religious teachers esteemed study more highly than they did worship, having designated the former as eternal life, and the latter, by contrast, as temporal existence, there was nevertheless something unusual in Dr. Marx' complete immersion in scholarship at a very early age. Unlike many other Jewish scholars of renown, he is not a Ghetto product, and the narrow confines of the noisy *heder* and the dingy *Klaus* did not make up his whole world. The Rhineland town of Elberfeld, where he was born in 1878, had very few Jews, probably no more than eight hundred souls, and the home in which he was reared suffered nothing of the poverty and little of the oppression that was then the lot of East European Jewry. Neither did Koenigsberg, where the Marx family settled in 1885, teem with Jewish masses, nor did Torah utter its voice in its broad places. His father was a banker of high repute among business men, philanthropists and educators, respected alike for his keen business sense, impeccable integrity and simple piety. The son, likewise, possessed all the necessary qualifications to become a man of affairs. He was tall, slender, and handsome, brilliant, gentle, and unaffected. His soft eyes, clean white skin, delicate features, and high forehead, gave his face a composite expression of shyness, meditateness, congeniality, and tenderness. His noble plainness of manner, transparent smile and hearty laugh, together with the uncommon retentiveness of his memory, made conversation with him a delight. When he was still a mere lad he could count among the people he had met a considerable number of men of distinction and renown, prestige and influence. He should not, it would seem, have been plagued by inner conflicts, and could not have stood in need of escaping from himself or his environment. There was definitely nothing in his personal experiences to send him to rummage bookstalls and ransack libraries. He could easily have turned out to be the rich man's son or dilettante or *Schoengeist*. What was it then that made him the exception among the young men in the land of his birth and in his circumstances? What was it that impelled him to become the man of the book, exclusively and absolutely, the very embodiment of that tradi-

tion that pronounced the study of Torah as equal to all of the Commandments?

The answer to these questions is presumably not far to seek. It is undoubtedly to be found in a great natural propensity and potent influences. Of the former we need say no more than that Dr. Marx was to the manner born. He could no more have helped taking to Jewish learning and scholarship than could the born musician to music. Of the influences that nurtured and encouraged him we must speak at greater length.

There were, to begin with, his parents. Both the father and the mother lived exemplary lives, and, by virtue of their devoutness and reverence, lent an air of charm and attractiveness to the laws, customs and rites of Judaism. The son has certainly emulated the example of his parents. The unyielding consistency, the depth of conviction with which he has observed the traditions of his people, the beauty and dignity in which he and his life mate, the gracious and genial daughter of the famous sage and saint, David Hoffmann, have enshrined the altar of their home, have rarely been surpassed anywhere.

But the parents loved learning no less than they did the folkways and mores of their people. The father's vocation, to be sure, was banking, but his avocation was Torah, though strictly speaking he considered the latter as his more important occupation. On his desk at the office there were to be seen at least as many folios of the Talmud as account books, and he seldom opened the latter of a morning before he had digested his daily portions of the intricate discussions of Abaye and Rava. Prompted by his own scholarly interests, and in accordance with good old Jewish practice, the father lost no time in introducing his son at a very early age to the magic of the sacred letters and the treasures and mysteries they contained. He was not, however, too patient a teacher, and when the interminable questions of his precocious pupil proved too much for him, it was the mother who came to the rescue, and with characteristic maternal tenderness and long sufferance, resolved the perplexities of the young mind and spurred it to seek more knowledge. It should be stated that even in those early days when the Marx family still lived in Elberfeld the efforts of the parents at educating their son

were supplemented by the instructions he received from Zigismond Auerbach, the town's rabbi, and from a Rav Kram. Rabbi Kram, an immigrant from Russia, and faithful to the system of education then prevailing in his native land, stuffed him with the contents of the tractate of *Baba Mezia*, omitting ne'er a מאי קא משמע לן, ('what does this mean?') or a מנא הני מלי ('how do we know this?').

Koenigsberg where, it will be recalled, the family settled in 1885, opened up new vistas before the eager lad, its gymnasium having provided him with a solid foundation for his secular studies. Unfortunately, overwork seriously impaired his health, and his pious parents, in the hope of assuring his recovery, took a vow to encourage their son to study for the rabbinate. Consequently, upon his graduation from the gymnasium, young Marx was dispatched to Halberstadt, where for the space of a year he gave himself over completely and exclusively to the study of the Talmud, the walls of the town's ancient and hallowed Klaus resounding day and night to the untiring voice of the diligent student. His mentor in Halberstadt, with whom he also made his home, was Rabbi Joseph Nobel. The rabbi, encouraged by the progress his charge was making in his studies, soon initiated him into the labyrinthine commentaries of the Tosafists. "You are now in stormy waters," the teacher would enjoy jesting when his pupil was baffled by the ingenuity of the French scholars, "and it is either sink or swim." Dr. Marx did not sink, but buffeted the swelling billows *lotis viribus*, and returned home at the end of the year feeling some satisfaction that he had acquired competence in steering his way among the rocks and shoals of the Talmud and the works of its great annotators.

Back in Koenigsberg he launched in good earnest on his academic career and new factors came to bear on the inclination and bent of his mind. First, there were the University of Koenigsberg where Dr. Marx now matriculated, and its library, that contained a sizeable collection of Hebraica and Judaica. Dr. Marx went at this collection with unparalleled avidity, reading and rereading in the five years that he remained at the university every book in it, practically committing whole volumes to memory. He thus mastered the contents of a variety



of scholarly periodicals and long-forgotten books that neither R. Auerbach nor the saintly Talmudist, Rabbi Nobel, were qualified to bring to his attention. It was at that time too that, under the tutelage of Professor Franz Ruehl, he gained an insight into ancient history and familiarity with the methods of handling a manuscript. Dr. Marx speaks to this day gratefully and respectfully of this gifted historian, who was the first to impress upon him the importance and indispensability of primary sources in any attempt to evaluate and understand the past.

However, though the opportunities that the University of Koenigsberg afforded him were considerable, and though the advances he was making in his studies were significant, they were little when compared with the momentum which contact with three great Jewish scholars were to lend his inner urge. Two of them — Abraham Berliner and Moritz Steinschneider — were in Berlin, and Dr. Marx began to visit them regularly and sit at their feet. The third — David Hoffmann — he was to come to know more closely and intimately at a later date. In view of the indelible imprint these three left on his life and work it ought not to be out of place to say here a few words about each of them.

Professor Berliner, the autodidact from Obersitzko, Posen, was a man of indefatigable diligence. His store of general knowledge was great and his erudition in Bible, the Targumim, Talmud, Midrash, history, codes, commentaries, liturgy, Hebrew poetry, and bibliography, prodigious. His unlimited scholarly pursuits took him to every well-stocked library in England, France, Germany, and Italy, and few were the Jewish manuscripts that escaped his eager, searching eye. In the course of his travels he accumulated a large library of his own, and gained proficiency in several languages, particularly Italian. As a result his work reflects not only breadth of learning, but his journeyings and searchings as well. Practically everything that came from his pen is a model of thoroughness if not of form. Form, it must be admitted, he seldom achieved, either because of inattention or lack of talent. If, however, as historian, for example, he was deficient in the architectural genius and felicity of expression of a Graetz, where the spirit or essence of the past of his people

was concerned he had the intuition of an artist. His labors on the Targumim, liturgy, Rashi, and the other great commentaries on the Bible bear ample testimony to his having recognized instinctively which were the sources that had been pivotal in the development of Judaism. Though no phase of Jewish law or lore was ever for him merely a branch of study, and though he was not the pure rationalist or meticulous logician, he nevertheless employed scientific methods in his researches, and brought to bear upon historical problems as well as upon living issues keen intelligence and scholarly objectivity. We may add that Dr. Berliner was no recluse, but an active participant in the life about him.

Professor Hoffmann, like Professor Berliner, was also a man of unremitting toil, vast erudition, and remarkable versatility. As student he adhered strictly to the *והגית בו יומם ולילה* ('thou shalt meditate therein day and night'). As author he made his motto — *nulla dies sine linea*, ('no day without a line'). Professor Marx reports that he had often seen his father-in-law "jump up during a meal, while waiting for the next course, to snatch a few moments for writing." But Professor Hoffmann was noted even more for his native gifts than for his tremendous and unceasing industry. Starting out the child prodigy or the *Wunderkind* of Verbo, as he was affectionately called, he matured with the years into a creative genius. His memory had become "a plastered cistern that [did] not lose a drop" and his critical faculties, original and penetrant. Little wonder that his researches should prove to have been epoch making. Thus when he applied himself to the Mishnah and the Midrash, he discovered, despite the confusion and obscurity in which their beginnings are entangled, the lines upon which their development had followed. When he turned to investigate the Wellhausen school of Biblical Criticism, he quickly detected the faulty knowledge of Hebrew and Jewish law upon which many of its theories were based. The outer form of his work differs from that of Professor Berliner, reflecting in the conciseness of its language and lucidity of its style the brilliant mathematician and master of classical languages and literature that he was. It should be underscored, so far as the immediate purpose of

this paper is concerned, that the key to an understanding of this "rarely harmonious personality," this man of "gigantic intellect and saintly soul," of "deep-rooted piety and childlike simplicity," was his love of Judaism.

Towering above these two, certainly in the opinion of Dr. Marx, was the colossus Moritz Steinschneider, the scholar between whom and whose books the frontiers were only shadowy. This was so not because the bibliophile in him was the whole of him. To the contrary. His self-identity was marked and clearly outlined against the background of his immense learning and unending preoccupations. He tried his hand at *belles lettres*, and could execute brilliantly on the piano an Italian fugue or bravura. He was an excellent conversationalist, reticent only on one subject — himself, and one to brighten up a drawing-room. He was the founder of a society for the restoration of Palestine, a successful preacher, who could plead eloquently for making Hebrew the language of instruction for the Jewish scholar or theologian. These interests and talents, however, he did not pursue with any measure of consistency. For he regarded them as rather incidental. He tried them for a while and forgot them.

The passion of his being, his staff of life were books — all kinds of books, manuscripts, incunabula, fragments — and everything connected with them; their contents, authors, title pages, and colophons; the stories they told; the materials that were employed in producing them; choice of type; use of decoration; arrangement of margins; the places where they are to be found; the commentaries that had been written on them and the treatises about them; the parts of them that were lost and the lacunae or errors or obscurities in those that have survived, and the transformations and transmigrations they had undergone ever since they came from the pen of the original author until fate or accident or searching had brought them into his hands. In a word, he was eager to have as complete and thorough an account of them as sweat and acumen could supply.

All this information was assembled to a purpose, perhaps we should say to a twofold purpose. Steinschneider was the genuine bibliographer, objective and precise to a fault, aiming to obtain, broaden, impart, and perpetuate knowledge. Toward this end



alone he was prepared to work a lifetime without encouragement, without ever thinking of deriving any benefits from his converseance with books or exploiting it as a *moyen de parvenir*. But, he was also the proud Jew, and he had good reason to want to show "the people and the princes" the riches and beauty of Judaism. And it was the desire to accentuate the relation of the Jews to general culture and the part they played in mathematics, medicine, philosophy and other intellectual pursuits, as much as science for science's sake, that impelled him to examine literary memorials of all ages and regions, in print and in manuscript, and compose his stupendous catalogues.

Professor Marx, we may well imagine, is disposed to speak of his teachers enthusiastically and respectfully, but when he writes of Steinschneider, we are made to believe that he was just emerging from a seminar with the master, so vivid and fresh is the impression, so unrestrained the excitement. "I see the dear old man," he tells us in one place, "before my eyes, sitting at his writing table, and a feeling of love and reverence is in my heart that words cannot express." Once he mentions Steinschneider's name he will not let go of it until, to indulge in a bit of Hebrew rhetoric, he has read the Hallel over it to the end, that is, until he has exhausted all praise. Others are his "revered" teachers, but Steinschneider, he is the "greatest polyhistor Judaism has produced;" "the greatest Jewish scholar of our time;" "that most eminent of Jewish scholars and bibliographer of Jewish literature par excellence;" "the most learned, most industrious and most exact of Jewish scholars;" "the representative of a collector who loved his books;" "the famous master;" whom "all must consider their teacher;" whose "history of Jewish literature remains unequalled;" whose "Catalogue . . . marks an epoch in the history of Hebrew bibliography;" whose article on Maimonides in the same catalogue is "an inexhaustible mine;" whose "Researches on the contribution of the Jews to general culture during the Middle Ages are fundamental, without [which] pioneer work the subject could not be discussed." In short, there is no end to the encomiums the illustrious disciple heaps upon his teacher.

More than that, we can see Steinschneider grow and shadow



over Dr. Marx to the extent of actually affecting some of his personal relations. He takes over his aversion for Carmoly, and his kindly feelings toward Miss Adeline Goldberg, and forms a bond of friendship with the late Dr. George Kohut because of their mutual affection and admiration for the man. In this connection it is also interesting to note that one of the first things Dr. Marx did upon coming to the Seminary was to assemble for its library from the four corners of the earth one hundred comparatively unknown medical books, most probably because of Steinschneider's absorbing interest in bibliographies on medicine.

Surely so deep an imprint was not likely to fade with the years. Neither have the other influences we have been considering lost their effect on him. Given then his natural propensity, the teachers he had, the parental piety and love of learning, the hermit years in the Klaus of Halberstadt and at the library of the University of Koenigsberg — the eight long years he served scholarship without ever thinking of applying for or taking a degree — and the earnestness and indefatigability he has brought to his craft, would certainly seem to be fully accounted for. However, upon reading Dr. Marx or conversing with him, we become aware of still another factor that has proved decisive in the shaping of his life's work, namely, his love for Israel.

It was an early and great American who begged his fellow countrymen to understand that "the first of patriotic duties was learning, knowing one's country and people." Some such ever present sense of duty has unquestionably constituted the matrix of the resolution and unconquerable patience that have made of Dr. Marx the peerless Jewish bibliographer and ardent Jewish historian that he is. Only such passionate devotion to one's people could explain why a normal, vibrant youth of seventeen should have conceived the idea of reading every Jewish book on the shelves of a university library, or why, at the end of half a century of back-breaking toil, the now world-renowned scholar should still examine an illustrated manuscript of the Hagadah or a richly adorned incunabulum of the persecuted and harried Soncinos with radiant happiness. It was simply that he has been toiling to the end of unravelling Israel's past, search out

its dark places, unearth, decipher, elucidate, and make available its records, trace out its course, bridge its gaps, and clarify and understand its meaning. The dispersed melancholy fragments of books and manuscripts have not been to him just so many texts on which to try his erudition in bibliography or his inborn palaeographic skill, but the ruins of Jewish communities and the precious débris of their acropolises. He saw in them the silent agonized spectators of the dismantling of their communal organizations, the destruction of their synagogues, libraries and philanthropic institutions; the martyrdom and enforced conversion of their saints and sages and common people; and, alas, of their internal strife and controversies, the pettiness, greed, vain ambitions, and arrogance of *parnasim* and others vested with authority. And this too. These fragments were the proud witness of the versatility and depth of their cultural interests, the massiveness and grandeur of their intellectual achievements, the sanctity and beauty of their home life, their divine wrestlings, deep optimism, and never failing resilience.

All this fastened hold on Dr. Marx and led him beyond *lo fren del'arte*, as it were, beyond the interests and requirements of scholarship. It was in the hope of catching one more glimpse of Jewish life, of seeing the faintest traces of its trials and triumphs, that he made the weary tale of the dispute of a humble and undistinguished Rabbi a surrogate for sleep, or that he waded through hundreds of pages of the digressions and irrelevancies of a mediaeval author with the eagerness with which a boy devours the adventures of Dick Tracy. Thus he published a collection of poems on Maimonides, not because he was impressed with its art and beauty, but because it threw light on the greatest Jew of the Middle Ages and the controversies that had raged about him. He rejoiced at the discovery of the Genizah because, "It opened new chapters of the Jewish past and brought never-dreamt of information about the literary and spiritual activity of the Jews in Egypt, Palestine, and Babylonia . . ." He found great satisfaction in the growth of the Seminary Library, in the building of which he made one of his primary concerns the assembling of literature on the history of the Jews in various lands, because, "Recent events have made us appreciate more



than ever the importance of knowing the past of our people. Only the realization of the spiritual values for which our forefathers have been suffering makes it possible for the present generation to bear up under the strain of the happenings of the present time . . . During the dark periods of history the Jews upheld the Torah, but it was also the Torah that upheld them." He wrote an exciting account of "A Jewish Cause Célèbre" because the historical material contained in the Pesakim of 1519 "help us to get a picture of the life of our forefathers . . ." He erected a memorial to the earliest Jewish printers because "they served their God and their people with their 'holy work.' " He explained the universal mourning that had followed upon the death of Maimonides as having been due to the fact that the great philosopher had been active for more than half a century in the service of his people and left it a rich heritage. Finally, to give one more instance out of an endless number available in his work, in 1943, when he was seeing through the press his *Studies in Jewish History and Booklore*, he did so with "the hope and prayer that peace will soon be restored and stricken Israel comforted." Evidently it was more than teachers' and parental guidance and a natural propensity — it was the heart that ached for and exulted on Israel that made Dr. Marx the man of the Jewish book.

This, in brief, is the story of the many factors that have influenced Professor Marx in varying degree. Now to be in keeping with the character of this learned volume, we should undoubtedly proceed immediately to a discussion of Dr. Marx' work. But how can one of his pupils suppress the desire to say at least a word about the teacher's loveable human traits — his kindnesses, his readiness to help all who turn to him, his respect for the labors of others, and his considerateness for their feelings, sensibilities, and reputation. How can anyone writing about him overlook such charming commonplaces as the fact that all through the years this eminent scholar has carried in his pockets sweets to be given to children coming his way; or that he has delighted in lifting a tot by its tiny hands above his head. Or can one forget, on the one hand, the graciousness that has moved him to greet every act of generosity or indication of



learning with warm praise, that prompted him to mention the names of young scholars side by side with those of the most celebrated savants, that led him to fill his pages with acknowledgment of indebtedness to teachers, colleagues, students and friends, and, on the other, the modesty that has inhibited him from including, in all the hundreds of papers he wrote, a single autobiographical item or volunteering the least information about any of his talents or the languages he possesses. Who, reading the many reports he has published on the library, will gain, in the press of tributes he pays to so many benefactors, the faintest inkling of the fact that he was the master-builder of that famous institution.

When Dr. Marx does allow himself a personal reference, it is rather to speak of the things he has left undone or does not know. Thus, he informs us that he is "ignorant" of Italian, that he "understands nothing" of musical intervals; that he is no specialist in Arabic literature; that he is unable to identify certain quotations; that he does not qualify to emend the text of a mediaeval Hebrew poem; that his manifestly brilliant articles on Maimonides are no more than an inadequate outline; that his labors on Steinschneider were intended only to provide material for the future biographer. This is about the only kind of information we can gather concerning him from his writings. Otherwise "he hath hid himself among the stuff." "The great," Emerson said, "always introduce us to facts; the small, introduce us to themselves." Dr. Marx is truly great, genuinely humble, cast in the mold of saints and sages. His sweet tenderness, child-like simplicity, and loveable selflessness defy description. Perhaps then it were better after all to proceed to treat of his work and leave the attempt to portray him to the artist who can limn aright

The proper shining of a soul  
Where nothing ordinary dwells.

But to survey his productiveness of fifty years is hardly less ambitious an undertaking. His career as scholar goes back to his maiden efforts, recognition having come to him when he was still in his teens. By the time he was twenty-five he had laid a

sufficiently solid foundation for his scholarly reputation to have been called by the sainted Dr. Schechter to the two positions he now occupies at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, namely, those of Professor of History and Librarian. To make surveying his work more difficult, his *magnum opus* is available in manuscript only, and his other writings, more than four hundred in number, are scattered, except for the *History of the Jewish People* on which he collaborated with the late Dr. Margolis and the aforementioned recently published *Studies*, over periodicals, reports, *Festschriften* and *Jahrbuecher* in a variety of languages. Aside from the wealth of this material and the state of dispersion in which it exists, there is the technical character of much of his writing and its compactness. No summary can do justice to his painstaking scholarship, his attention to minutiae, his acumen and quick perception as investigator, his skill as palaeographer, his brilliance of conjecture and caution of statement, his accuracy, his ease in handling Semitic, classical and European languages, let alone his conciseness, preciseness, and thoroughness.

A paper by Dr. Marx is either an indivisible whole or a composite of significant details and fine points. Not being in the habit of using words for the purposes of stylistic embellishment or bare speculation, he will not put pen to paper unless he has something new to impart. His main interest is to add to the fund of exact knowledge; to confirm and demonstrate or to contest and refute the correctness of a date, the authenticity of a fact, trustworthiness of a source; or to do the same with respect to the validity of a claim put forth in behalf of causes and motives operating in the affairs of peoples and individuals. Facts, facts, facts are paramount with him. With undisciplined conjecturing, vagueness, and indifference, he will show no patience. He is the first to hail comprehensive, architectonic histories of whole periods or countries, or flowing descriptions of mediaeval Synagogues, Menorahs or Hagadahs, provided they do not substitute rhetoric for data. For he regards the giving heed to particulars as the *sine qua non* of his craft, and he will unearth a detail at great effort and set it forth with the seriousness with which he does a cardinal point.

Thus he notes that in a certain Yemenite manuscript Psalm 118 was copied in all kinds of geometrical designs; that in another the Talmudic story of the destruction of the Temple is followed by a list of days to be observed as fasts; that a certain scribe had the curious name of Abner ben Ner ha-Sharoni; that in the Hizar edition of the Turim one volume has a lion in a black border and another in a blue border; that R. Jacob Landau's *Agur* was the first printed book to include an approbation; that a Bologna edition of the Psalms concludes with the text of Grace after meals; that a Lisbon incunabulum and an Egyptian manuscript both contained musical indications for the sounding of the Shofar; that Maimonides had coined a Hebrew word for minerals, which word was overlooked by Ben Yehuda; that a Yemenite Pentateuch, probably a copy of the text of Ben Asher, was bound in an unusual box-binding; that the format of two song books from Aden was most strange — exceedingly long and curiously narrow; that a certain scholar had purloined two manuscripts when their owners refused to lend them to him.

Such details fill Dr. Marx' work to overflowing, and there is no need of multiplying here examples or asking whether or no he ascribes to them great importance. Let the reader instead turn to his great volume of *Studies*, "one of the best books about books that has ever been written," and he will find that its author has not hesitated to open an opus which contains, among others, two brilliant papers on Maimonides, a masterful account of the expulsion of the Jews from Spain, the absorbing story of da Norsa of Ferrara, and the beautiful sketches of several of his teachers, colleagues, and friends — the author, we repeat, has not hesitated to put at the beginning of such a volume a brief paper, one might almost be tempted to say an extensive note, on whether the position of the Book of Daniel in the Hagiographa had been universally accepted by the Rabbis or not. True this note is of more than passing interest since it opens up the very important question as to what our sages thought of Daniel, whether they regarded him as a prophet, and that other which is even more basic in understanding Judaism and differentiating it from Christianity, whether they classed the apoca-



lyptic contents of his book with prophecy. Dr. Marx, however, is apparently leaving the theology to the theologians and is limiting himself here, as he does in the major portion of his writings, to establishing a fact, to making a fine point. Obviously surveying hundreds of such minutiae and technicalities is an ambitious and toilsome undertaking.

Fortunately Dr. Marx tells us somewhere that his three major fields of interest are bibliography, biography, and history, and it were certainly a case of good judgment to stay within the bounds he indicated. Not that it isn't tempting to go beyond them and investigate the mass of rabbinic learning he has accumulated, or to deal with his learned notes and disquisitions on Talmudic methodology, liturgy, Midrash, and so on. Certainly those of us who take pride in the Seminary faculty are especially grateful for these, his "minor" ventures, since it was his work on the *Seder Olam* that led him to seek out Dr. Schechter in Cambridge. Dr. Schechter soon recognized, and had not forgotten several years later when he was selecting a teaching staff for the Seminary, that the shy, pious, industrious youth who had come to see him from Oxford, where he was at the time ransacking its collections of Hebraica, and who would travel week-ends from the University city to London for a kosher meal, was indeed, as Mrs. Schechter had put it, "a very nice young fellow," and also quite a mature and competent scholar. Some of the older graduates of the Seminary still remember Dr. Marx as their teacher in Talmud, for that was the subject he taught in his first year at the institution. But profitable though it would be to follow these by-paths, space, if nothing else, compel us to travel on the highway the master himself has marked off, and to start out on what is without doubt its broadest lane, namely, bibliography.

Let us then begin by saying at the very outset that Dr. Marx' contribution to our knowledge about and of Jewish books is inestimable. Without laying down any rules for bibliographical investigations, since, as was pointed out by Roland B. McKerrow, "none is possible," but agreeing presumably with those who in recent decades have given the term "bibliography" more extended meaning, he has dealt with the whole series of processes

operative in the production of a book and all matters related to its contents subsumed under the respective designations: form or formal and subject bibliography. We can do here no more than give brief consideration to the following four phases of his work in this field. These are: (1) Descriptions of manuscripts, incunabula, and books printed later than the fifteenth century. (2) Presenting new information or disproving or authenticating old information. (3) Stimulating investigators to further research. (4) Building of the Library.

(1) Dr. Marx very rarely omits a detail of interest to the bibliophile or of importance to the scholar. One example alone, and only a resumé at that, will suffice to show that his descriptions of books are models of preciseness and thoroughness. Thus he begins his account of the remarkable Spanish incunabulum of the Service for the Day of Atonement, to be found in the Seminary Library, with the reminder that the available fragments of Spanish Jewish incunabula are as a rule wanting in colophons, and proceeds to suggest that many of the incunabula may not have had any colophons to begin with. For in Spain it was not unusual for marranos to engage in the printers' trade, and these harried victims of the Inquisition were certainly not disposed to advertise their share in the "holy work." We are therefore not altogether surprised not to find in the Mahzor under discussion any particulars as to printer, place, and year of publication, although Dr. Marx, in a footnote, conjectures that our incunabulum was most probably preceded by a Service for New Year in which these details were given. But if we should ask how it was possible, in the absence of this other Service and the information it contained, to determine with any degree of certainty that we had before us a Spanish product, the answer is simple. The eagle eye of Dr. Marx discovered in the book's leather binding, unmistakably its first, some manuscripts used as padding that leave no doubt as to their Spanish origin.

Now that we are sure of the place of birth of this wandering ritual of a wandering people we look at it a second time more eagerly. For it did not come to the Library from Spain at all. It went into exile at least twice, once to Carpi, where it found shelter in the home of Baruch Hayyim, a member of the famous

Finzi family, and a second time to North Africa, from where it was transported across the Atlantic and presented to the Seminary by Mr. Mortimer L. Schiff. Its striking oblong format reveals that its troubles may have begun early, when it still belonged to its first owner, probably a marrano, who had it made long and narrow in shape so as to be able to hide it in his long, loose sleeve, in case inquisitorial spies happened to invade his privacy during the hour of clandestine prayer.

We should, of course, expect Dr. Marx to tell us all there is to be known about a book with so sorrowful and typical a Jewish tale, and we are not disappointed. He gives us the measurements of its binding, the number of its leaves, the length of its pages, and the number of lines to a page. He notes that the type is Spanish, that the "initials" are large, that sometimes whole lines are in large type, and that when the latter is the case the page will have nine lines (in two instances only eight) against the usual ten; that some sections are vocalized and others unvocalized; that the vowel points were printed separately, and that when they occur they are not always without error; that the name of the author of a hymn is generally given in large letters but that of his father in small ones; that where hymns by the same author follow each other consecutively his name is not repeated, having instead the Hebrew לזל or Arabic להول, that is, 'idem. of blessed memory;' that the Name of God is indicated by two large *yuds* followed by an inverted *nun*; that abbreviation marks are as a rule missing; that pages 113-14, 119-20, and 164-5 were, for some mysterious reason, left blank and that the first four were later filled in by two different "hands," employing the Spanish-rabbinic script; that the last line of a page is frequently eccentric, consisting at times of no more than two or three words placed either in the middle or at the beginning. Dr. Marx further lets us share his joy at the excellent state of preservation in which the volume has come down to us despite its many trials and exiles, it having suffered only one censorial excision in the Adoration on p. 111<sup>a</sup> of the שלא עשנו. For having the Mazhor in its entirety, we not only see clearly, as Dr. Marx points out and as is apparent from the complete outline of its contents he appends at the conclusion of his study, its place in



the liturgy but are in possession of a source that fully corroborates the order of the Spanish rites as determined by Zunz.

So much then for the account of this remarkable incunabulum. Elsewhere in Dr. Marx' bibliographic descriptions we shall find our attention directed to such matters as the quality of parchment or paper, color of ink, calligraphy, inking, literal transcripts of title-pages and colophons, 'factotum initials,' 'catchwords,' margins, ornaments, lacunae, ruptures, erasures, obscurities, printers, printing establishments, misprints, bad readings, methods of reference, the number of editions available and the variations in them, commentaries and commentaries on commentaries, catalogues, public libraries, private collections, famous collectors — in a word, everything to satisfy the curiosity of the lovers of books and sate the thirst of the searchers after knowledge.

(2) Painstakingly exact and particular about his dates and facts, he has esteemed nothing too small to attract his attention nor any error too insignificant not to invite his correction. As a result he resolved many moot problems, showed many theories or hypotheses to be without foundation, and gathered such a large variety of new bibliographical, biographical, and historical data that the mere listing of them would require a volume of considerable size. We can do here no more than present the following few examples chosen at random from this wealth of material.

Somewhere about the thirties of the preceding century Solomon Dubno discovered, in a manuscript containing writings pertaining to Maimonides and his work, a Letter written by Sheshet ha-Nasi ben Isaac of Saragossa and addressed to the scholars of Lunel, in which the Spanish scholar criticized severely R. Meir Abulafia for his unrestrained attack on Maimonides for his views on resurrection. The Epistle being of some length, Dubno did not copy it and nothing more was heard of it. By 1879 B. Bruell considered it as lost, though in 1876 Graetz and in 1877 Berliner had published some excerpts from it. A Paris manuscript contained the last page of the Letter, the rest having been purloined, so it was suspected, by a none too scrupulous scholar. A Vatican manuscript had still less to offer. In 1935 Professor Marx published the complete text of this interesting document from an Adler manuscript.

Some years before that, in 1926, he enriched our knowledge of the mediaeval mind in more ways than one with his *The Correspondence between the Rabbis of Southern France and Maimonides on the Subject of Astrology*. Aside from introducing us to two hitherto rather inaccessible astrological treatises that shed considerable light on one aspect of the thinking of Isaac Pulgar and indirectly perhaps establish the approximate year in which Maimonides concluded the third part of his *Guide*, Dr. Marx' treatment of this exchange of letters gives us as clear an insight into the beliefs, superstitions, perplexities, and irrepressible doubts of the learned and the ignorant in the Middle Ages as could possibly be afforded in the limited space he allowed himself, and further illumines hidden depths in the portrait of Maimonides perceived only faintly until now. We see, on the one hand, philosophers highly educated in the sciences of their day and brilliant Talmudists devoutly pious, one and the other the sworn enemies of idolatry and imagery, entangled in astrological calculations from which they neither can nor are too eager to extricate themselves. On the other hand we hear this strange, severe rebuke uttered by Maimonides, combining reason and militarism in one. "Our forefathers," he is saying, "spent their time in following such teachings out of which they expected great benefits instead of concentrating their efforts upon learning the art of war and conquering of neighboring countries. The prophets rightly chastised them for their foolishness. For truly fools they were and pursued useless things."

In one of his most technical and ingenious papers, Dr. Marx, by authenticating a statement of Joseph Kimhi, establishes ibn Gabirol's claim to the authorship of *The Choice of Pearls*. In another he makes it highly probable that the enigmatic Paltiel, so enthusiastically portrayed in the Chronicle of Ahimaaz, is after all perhaps none other than Jauhar, vizier of Al-Muizz. In a third we come pretty near determining the exact number of Jews in Spain generally and in Castile particularly prior to the expulsion. In a fourth we learn that the first books to have been printed in Africa and the Balkans were respectively the Abudraham of 1521, for which type was imported from Portugal, and the 1493 Hebrew incunabulum of Constantinople. In the



same paper we learn further that the first printing press in Cairo dates back to 1562 and that in Damascus to 1605, and that at the end of the sixteenth century Donna Reyna, the widow of Joseph Nasi, duke of Naxos, had put up a press in her home.

Curious, strange, engaging are some of the following items: At the end of the first part of a manuscript containing Isaac of Troki's *חוק אמונה*, is to be found a description of a Catholic mass. The manuscript of another well-known polemical work, the *ספר נצחון* of Yom Tov Lipman of Muelhausen, preserves two parodies of *יגדל* that are aimed at such creeds as the man-God, triune Deity, and the dying God. Less fortunate than the parodies of *יגדל* were the Commentaries of Rashi. Lazy copyists invariably omitted the illustrations that the great commentator often inserted in his text for the benefit of the reader. A relative of Rashi, perhaps his daughter, Rachel by name, and her husband, Eliezer, intrude upon our attention for quite a different reason. These two undistinguished members of the family of Tosafists changed their names, having called themselves Belle-Assez and Joselin, a practice indulged in by so many grandes and signoras of the house of Israel before them and since. Samuel ha-Nagid is reputed to have been the first Jew to own a great library. A Mohammedan scholar wrote a commentary on the first part of Maimonides' *ספר המדע*. Dante, when writing *The Divine Comedy*, had before him Jacob ben Makir's *Almanach*. Kalonymos ben Kalonymos wondered at the variation of the Divine Names in Genesis 1-11. Don Gazalo de Vivero, bishop of Salamanca, ordered in his will that there should be placed in the library of his church together with his other books certain treatises of Abraham Zacuto. Shemtob ben Jamil, whose children were baptised in Spain and who had himself barely escaped with his life, summoned all his strength and composed in his old age a book entitled *Keter Shemtob*, the bereaved father having hoped in this wise to perpetuate his name. The diligence of Dr. Marx rescued him indeed from oblivion, but of his book only four pages have survived. Joseph Solomon del Medigo holds the invention of printing responsible for the increase in and spread of inferior books and, confident in the survival of good and



useful works, warns the printers in the language of Ecclesiastes, regarding the trash they are multiplying, that "There is no remembrance of them in former times, neither will there any remembrance be of them in later times." From days closer to our own we hear of an old-fashioned Rabbi and Talmudist in a small town of Moravia writing to Steinschneider in the first half of the last century in English, and of a responsum by David Hoffmann on the attitude of Jewish law toward woman suffrage.

(3) Enough bait here for the investigator! Dr. Marx, however, will take nothing for granted but whets the appetite incessantly, being apparently of the opinion that to do so is one of the tasks of the Jewish bibliographer and bibliography. "I frequently refer to manuscripts in the Jewish Theological Seminary," he writes, "in the hope that American students of science may be induced to take up the study of them." To realize this hope he is ever dangling before our eyes opportunities for research and the acquisition of knowledge. Many of the song books from Yemen, North Africa, and various parts from Turkey, he gives out, might reward him who will search them with unknown compositions of our great poets. An unpublished Yemenite commentary on the Haftaret and Moses ibn Danon's little known *Kelale ha-Talmud*, he assures us, abound in interesting quotations. And what riches await us, he thinks aloud, in a search of the following sources: The Targum on the Earlier Prophets to be found in the incunabulum of Leiria, 1484; the Columbia Talmud manuscript; the Oxford manuscript of Abraham b. David's Commentary on Torat Kohanim and the material available at the Seminary bearing on this opus; the Damascus Arabic translation of the Samaritan Pentateuch; Abraham bar Hiyya's work on the Jewish calendar; and Judah Leon Mosconi's inventory of his worldly possessions. What would not our rewards be, he muses, in a comprehensive study of the language of Maimonides and in a proper edition of his Commentary on the Mishnah, or in an expert's appraisal of ibn Makta's contribution to mathematics and astronomy. Were it not fascinating, he urges, to examine the entries that famous owners of libraries made into their manuscripts; or to compare the woodcuts in the incunabulum of משל הקדמוני with the illustra-

tions in the manuscript of the same work. Were it not intellectually satisfying, he longingly asks, to know the signatories of Lunel, who addressed to Maimonides the letter on the *Guide* and that on astrology; or to have Judah ben Barzilai's reply to the letter on the latter subject that he had received from Abraham bar Hiyya. Dr. Marx would even have celebrations arranged on the anniversaries of Israel's great masters in order to attract the masses and acquaint them with the wealth of their heritage. Like his teacher, Steinschneider, he too "wishes merely to be handy-man in gathering and spreading the seed of good."

(4) The coping-stone of Dr. Marx' biographical labors is the Library he has built. To be sure the institution has had wise and generous benefactors, lovers of books, two or three of whom were no mean scholars. But in the truest sense it is the shadow of its Librarian, the creation of his unusual gifts as bibliographer. He had fixed in his memory the names of thousands of printed and unprinted books and knew the whereabouts of practically every private collection, collector, and book-dealer in existence. He was conversant with the bibliographical information to be found in the works of Joseph Solomon del Medigo, Giovanni Battista Jond, Giulio Bartolucci, Shabbethai Bass, J. B. di Rossi, J. Buxtorf, Rapoport, Zunz, Geiger, Luzzatto, Jellinek, Steinschneider, and in periodical literature. Thanks to the retentiveness of his memory he could recall, when there was need for it, such details as, for example, that O. H. Schor had described in an issue of the *Hehaluz* an Italian Siddur written by Meir ben Samuel de Salves at Pescia in 1397, and that Luzzatto mentioned in a letter a philosophic prayer by Maimonides occurring in a Parma manuscript. Add to this fund of knowledge about books, the Librarian's amazing skill in palaeography and his ability to read all kinds of handwriting in any language familiar to him with extraordinary ease, and we understand readily to what the Library owes its character or how it acquired, by way of illustration, such treasures as the following: In 1908 he purchases from a Palestinian dealer a defective copy of Bahya ben Asher's *Kad ha-Qemah* and in 1928 he identifies at a glance eight pages offered him by the same dealer as belonging

to that copy. In 1903 the Seminary came into possession of the second half of a volume of R. Zerahyah Halevi's critical notes on Alfasi. In 1923 Dr. Marx recognizes instantly, in a mass of new manuscripts acquired by the Library, the first half of that volume. A Yemenite dealer brings him a large bag bulging with innumerable fragments, and like a magician he pulls out the colophon page belonging to the second part of Maimonides which he had bought eight years earlier.

But not even this erudition and skill would have sufficed to build this veritable *Qiryat Sepher*. What, above all, provided the holy enterprise with momentum was the hope that beckoned Dr. Schechter to come to this country and his ardent desire, shared by the great scholars with whom he surrounded himself, to make America a *מקום תורה*. Dr. Marx knew what he wanted. He wanted to collect, as it were, the past and present of his people into one pulsation. He craved to have a library in which every conceivable branch of Judaism would have its habitation, none of which would contain a gap. As if anticipating the calamities that were to overwhelm the Jewish communities of Europe and their centers of learning, he warred on every interruption in the flow of books, toiling with unremitting eagerness and unwearied industry to assemble the fugitives of Israel and bring about, as it were, a reunion of the exiles. His solicitude and resolution proved infectious. Men brought their gifts to him as much out of reverence for the Librarian as out of interest in Jewish scholarship, and the *Qiryat Sepher* became a reality.

When the books accumulated and the fame of the library spread to the four corners of the earth, Dr. Marx liked nothing so much as exhibiting and pouring out the opulence at his disposal. In due time scholars everywhere, of every race, creed, and color discovered that in the world's vast metropolis there was available a librarian whose free generosity and ready helpfulness awaited them, and they came and learned and left with gratitude in their hearts. Little wonder that hardly a book is published these days, touching seriously on any phase of Judaism which does not contain somewhere in its Preface or in a footnote a word of acknowledgment to our revered teacher and the institution he has built.



It would, at this point be desirable, profitable, and enjoyable to take a peep into the immense manuscript adytum or roam the ten-story tower. But the limits imposed on this paper are in sight and we must proceed to a discussion of Dr. Marx' two other main fields of interest. We can therefore do no more and indeed no better than recommend a visit to the Library or refer the reader to several of the Librarian's treatises, such as *The Choice of Books by the Printers of Hebrew Incunabula*, *A New Collection of Manuscripts*, *The Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*, *The Polemical Manuscripts in the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*, *The Biblical Manuscripts and Rare Prints*, *Texts by and about Maimonides*, *Kitvei Yad Rephuim ba-Seminarion*, *The Books and Manuscripts of the Seminary Library in the exhibit of The New York Public Library*, and *Di Rambam Oisstellung in Museum fun Idishen Teologishen Seminar*. Above all we urge the reader to be on the lookout for a Maecenas who should at last make the publication of Dr. Marx' great catalogue a reality, a catalogue that we venture to guess will come to be regarded as *the* companion work to the *Catalogus Bodleianus*, the priceless legacy of the immortal Steinschneider himself.

It is in keeping with Dr. Marx' graciousness and his respect for nobility of character and enthusiasm for high scholarly attainments that he should have paid tribute to as many people as he has done. He cannot forget a teacher and will not ignore a friend. The jubilee or death or anniversary of one or the other, or of a colleague, saint or sage anywhere affect him profoundly and move him to appraise the scholar or praise the man or both. Neither will he forget the woman who achieves distinction in her own right or one who, like the wife of Rabbi Akiba, educes greatness from her husband.

Thanks to this kindness of the man, we have had from his pen some forty full-length portraits, heads, profiles, miniatures, and suggestive fragments, all of them executed in the tradition that pronounces biography to be an art or a branch of literature. Not that Dr. Marx indulges in rhetorical flourishes or loads his canvases. Decidedly not. He remains throughout the exact scholar, adhering strictly to scientific methods. Eschewing both

malicious invective and vain panegyrics, the distinguishing marks of the general run of biographies, he has written in the spirit of those biographers who have emulated Samuel Johnson, namely, with understanding and warmth but in consonance with the truth. He neither misrepresents the "life" of his hero nor does he heighten his "character," but subjecting both to the authority of facts, he produces a biography that is at once lifelike and interpretive.

Take, for example, his all too brief introductory remarks to his edition of *Zunz' Letters to Steinschneider*. It is remarkable how deftly he disposes the few strokes he allows himself there. True he did not have to mix the colors himself. Almost all he says is taken from the Letters. But the material he selected and the manner in which he arranged it reveal significant facets of the personality of Zunz that were either overlooked by others or not sufficiently appreciated, and give us an enticing, suggestive portrayal of Frau Zunz that makes us regret the writer's brevity. For the wife of the founder of *Judenwissenschaft* emerges from under Dr. Marx' brush a charming, sagacious, cultivated, alert, restless, dynamic woman who, but for her deep Jewishness and devotion to her husband's work, might have been another Rahel Varnhagen.

Or take the traits or trials of Maimonides he hits off by a reference or anecdote. Bring them together and we not only see clearly the relationship between the man and his time but gain a deeper insight into the character of the greatest Jew of the Middle Age than his biographers have yet afforded us. Do we need any plainer proof of the high regard in which he was held by his contemporaries or the universality of his fame than, by way of illustration, some of the following details culled from the writings of Dr. Marx. Maimonides, he points out, was revered by the masters of Lunel long before they had the opportunity of becoming acquainted with his great works. The office of Nagid, we learn, continued in his family for two centuries. Ibn Abi Usaybia, an Arab, in his history of physicians, we hear, quotes these verses, in which a Moslem judge paid tribute to the Jewish philosopher and physician:

Galen's medicine is only for the body; that of Abu Imran is suited for body and soul at the same time. If with his knowledge he had made himself the physician of the century, he would have cured it with his knowledge from the sickness of ignorance. If the moon had resorted to his art, it certainly would have obtained the perfection it lacks. On the day of full moon he would cure it of its spots, and from its disease on the day of conjunction.

Another Arab, we read, devoted a long article to him in his *Dictionary of Scientists*. The Jews in far off Yemen, the jottings continue, copied and recopied the books of Maimonides so frequently and handled them with such care that we owe the many Arabic originals that have survived of his writings altogether to their devotion.

What light do not scraps such as these further shed on the man: That he employed a tone of aloofness in his first letter to the scholars of Lunel, but that in his second letter, after he had recognized the full extent of their knowledge of rabbinics, his attitude was deferential and cordial; that all through his life he observed as a fast day the anniversary of a perilous voyage he had once made from Cairo to Acco; that he busied himself raising funds for the redemption of Jewish captives; that he refused the invitation of Richard the Lion-Hearted, or was it of Amalrich of Jerusalem, to become court physician when the one or the other was ruler of the Frankish kingdom in Palestine; that in prescribing his royal patient, Saladin, wine and song, the use of which is forbidden to Moslems, he excused himself on the ground that a physician could do nothing else than follow the requirements of his calling; that to the end of his days he never stopped revising his books.

The best of Professor Marx' biographical pieces, except perhaps for the fascinating, remarkably well-told tale of da Norsa, is, in our opinion, his *Rab Saadia Gaon*. We do not recall many instances of the compression of so much information within so moderate a compass. In approximately three and a half pages Dr. Marx traces the emergence of Babylonia as the intellectual



center of world Jewry, accounts for its superseding and overshadowing Palestine, treats of the impetus the centuries old slumbering community had received from the codification of the Mishnah and the effect of economic, political, and social conditions on the interpretation of the law in its two great academies, Sura and Pumbedita, indicates the periods of stagnation it experienced, and still has space left in which to describe the autonomy it enjoyed, the struggle for power between the exilarchate and Gaonate, and the pride or chauvinism that infected the leaders of both.

With this background concisely and vividly before our eyes, we are ready for the unfolding of the career of the brilliant, industrious, dynamic, resourceful, impetuous, and militant young Egyptian scholar — from his early beginnings in the land of the Nile and the shadowy traces of his peregrinations there and in neighboring countries, through his precocious authorship, growing fame, daring opposition to and censure of the leader of Palestinian Jewry, settlement in Babylonia, extraordinary success as teacher and in controversies with Karaites, staggering literary productivity, and his spectacular rise, though a foreigner, to the presidency of the Academy of Sura and, to the not unexpected clash with the man who raised him to this post, the self-opinionated, ambitious, haughty, despotic Exilarch David ben Zakkai, a clash that lasted for several years and, wearing out the two antagonists, culminated in a linsey-woolsey of reconciliation between them.

All these facts in the life of R. Saadia Gaon, Dr. Marx tells exquisitely in almost story-like fashion. Fixing from the very start on its main person, the account progresses from action to action, keying up the imagination and keeping up our interest until it reaches its climax, in the observance and celebration of Rab Saadia's anniversary a thousand years after his death. It should be added that the artistic effect is achieved not, as is generally the case in popular biographies, by a process of selection and omission. To the contrary, Dr. Marx records everything to a nicety, to a detail such as this, that the Gaon died "in the night between Sunday and Monday, May 16, 942, about 2 o'clock in the morning," but he holds the attention of his

reader and carries him along by the biographer's enthusiasm for his hero and his admiration of his immense productivity and the intellectual heights he attained in a comparatively short life.

Dr. Marx' contribution to history, his third field of interest, is even more notable than to biography and perhaps also than to bibliography. This is so not solely because of the unmatched one volume history of the Jewish people on which he and Professor Margolis collaborated, but primarily because of the following reasons:

(1) Professor Marx has given more earnest consideration to the contradictory conceptions of history and the methods of writing it than perhaps any Jewish scholar of note. Furthermore he has dwelt, more persistently than anyone, with particularizing emphasis on the insurmountable obstacles confronting the historian attempting a comprehensive universal history of the Jewish people. He is, we believe, to this day, or we should say today more than ever, of the opinion that the undertaking is beyond the talents and energies of any one man. Fully appreciative of and grateful for the labors of Jost, Cassel, Graetz, Dubnov and others, and recognizing to the fullest the enduring value of Graetz's *Geschichte der Juden*, despite its very serious limitations, he nevertheless is forced to conclude that their historical writings are outmoded and come nowhere near supplying the desideratum. The fault, of course, does not lie in the lack of genius or industry or in the temperaments of these men but in the nature of the subject, the gradual, halting evolution of its definitive status, the temptation to resort to rhetoric and exhortation, the tendency to allow the imagination to play on insufficiently established facts, the failure to attend to the unintentional tradition, the data, so to speak, thrust up by the subconscious, the disparate and scattered state of Jewish sources, the interconnection of Jewish history with the histories of almost all peoples of the past and present, and the plain and regrettable fact that the historical sense of our ancient forebears vanished from amongst their posterity in the course of the oppressive centuries of the Middle Ages. All this, Dr. Marx has reiterated time again, made Jewish historiography a Gargantuan task, laying upon Jewish historians

the burden of beginning from the beginning, requiring of them clear understanding of its scope, courageous envisagement of its objective, Job-like patience in collecting masses of material, sure methods and keen acumen in establishing and collecting facts, and precision in expounding them.

(2) Professor Marx, of course, did not stop at the difficulties and requirements but proceeded to outline the aims and determine the range of Jewish history. Taking his clue most probably from Karl Lamprecht, Henri Berr, James Harvey Robinson and other pioneers in and advocates of synthetic history, he has maintained that Jewish history must cease to be solely a record of persecution or, by way of escape from the painful tale of horrors, the annals of great men or monographs on literature or even all three combined. Neither will it suffice, he has insisted, to interlace such performances with continual or incidental references to economic conditions. Jewish history, he proposes, must concern itself with the totality of Jewish life in all its aspect, with its every throb and heart-beat that resulted in anything significant, with every occurrence that left its impress, with the lives of great men and the life of the common people and their interrelatedness. In other words, it must give us a complete picture objectively drawn of the complex of political, economic, psychological, and sociological phenomena that constituted in the past the substance and course of Jewish events and which though altered and transformed, are operative in molding the present.

(3) Simultaneously with urging the all-embracing character of history, he stresses its multiformity and heterogeneity. History is an organism, this he postulates as being axiomatic. But he desires us to remember first that an organism consists of dependent and interdependent parts and second that these parts cannot be taken hold of altogether in a single gesture. The pulse of history, he is prepared to concede, can be felt by the historian instantaneously but not so the "365 limbs and 248 veins." These must be examined individually and separately. In brief, one can come by a generalization as to what history is or ought to be by intuition, by a leap in the dark, but to write history involves elaborate preparation, prolonged study of an



endless variety of sources and subjects. Historians, Dr. Marx is sure, cannot escape the "years of analysis" which, Fustel de Coulanges suggested, were "required for one day of synthesis."

But to make the synthesis presupposes, of course, the availability and accessibility of the material to be synthesized, let alone of that which had to be analysed. For, says Dr. Marx, "the basis of all historical investigation is free access to all sources." But since with respect to Jewish sources this is not the case, he asks of those who would write Jewish history to be mindful of the preliminary tasks awaiting them. First comes the scientific editing and objective exposition of the texts obtainable. This in itself is no easy undertaking since the most important works by our most illustrious authors are full of scribal or printers' errors. Take, for example, the case of Maimonides. Even his writings stand in need of editing and can be made use of only after patient scrutiny. In his lifetime mistakes crept into almost everything he wrote, faulty texts and barbarous translations having been as much responsible for the vilification to which he was subjected as were the novelty and heterodoxy of his ideas. Though he is today universally acclaimed by conservatives and radicals alike, the authentic manuscripts of some of his most important works still slumber undisturbed in one library or another. His incomparable and unsurpassed Commentary on the Mishnah suffers in popularity, thanks to an intolerably poor Hebrew rendition. His unique and unexcelled Code is, except for some small parts of it, still to be favored with a critical edition. The Arabic original of his *Guide*, the undisputed classic of Jewish philosophy, and its Tibonite version have only recently found their redeemers. As for his minor treatises, except for the *Ma'amar ha-Yihud*, *Millot-ha-Higgayon*, *Pirquei Hazalah*, the Selections published by the late Professor Israel Friedlaender, and the Letters, who recalleth their name? It is not different with Rab Saadia Gaon, Abraham ibn Ezra, and, say, Abraham Zacuto, or, for that matter, the Mishnah and Talmud. If then "history," to quote de Coulanges again, "is made up of texts," Dr. Marx would require that the texts be made the starting-point for Jewish historiography.

Second, there is much searching after new sources to be done.

There are mounds to be excavated, pottery, seals, coins and medals to be traced down, tombstones to be deciphered, and archives to be examined in cities, towns and villages where Jews have lived (and where have they not been compelled to make their habitation?). Third, there is the need of building up a stockpile of dissertations, monographs, and whole treatises on an infinite variety of facts of the Jewish past — on the origin and development of religious and moral ideas, political, economic, social, and educational institutions, the great bodies of law and literature, customs and traditions, and the traces and vestiges of the arts and sciences. Fourth, when all of the old and new material will have been brought together, edited and expounded, it will still be necessary, if it is to become known to scholars and used by them, to compile compendia, encyclopaedias, concordances, bibliographies, indexes, and all such other works of reference and aids to research.

These then are some of the preliminary tasks Dr. Marx desires Jewish historians to keep in mind, the "years of analysis" of which we spoke above. Respecting a synthesis, he doubts whether it can ever again be achieved by one person. If we are to make one, that is if we are to have an all-inclusive, universal history of the Jewish people, it will, in his opinion, have to be henceforth a composite effort, the yield of the genius and sweat of experts in many fields of knowledge. That is why he has summoned institutions of learning and scientific bodies to pool their resources and undertake collective productions of the proportion, comprehensiveness and thoroughness of, say, the Cambridge histories. Only on this basis, would he agree, did we have the right to expect the coming of the "day of synthesis."

(4) Meantime Professor Marx has not merely played the preacher (fortunate man to have given up preaching after his first sermon!), but has himself performed some of these tasks with noteworthy results. Mindful of the fact that river water is purest nearest the fountain head, he searched the manuscripts and incunabula and unearthed and established facts as informative and illuminating in the field of history as, we have seen, his researches in bibliography and biography have proved to be. His studies on the choice of books by our earliest printers, an

epistolary guide, polemical manuscripts, responsa, or on almost any other subject he has dealt with, give us a clearer picture of the conditions under which our people lived in many lands.

Thus, on the back of the title page of one of Maimonides' letters which he has brought to our attention we discover a note on a tax imposed on the Jews of Spain. In a fragment on Deuteronomy coming from the same country, via Yemen, we learn that in exile the Gentiles compel the Jews to idolatry in two ways — by the persecutions recurring in every generation and by prohibiting work to Jews on Christian holidays. The Hebrew *Megillot Mizraim* discloses that in 1524 the Jews of Cairo escaped unexpectedly the wholesale destruction with which they had been threatened. A responsum inserted in the midst of a work on Talmudic methodology speaks of the greed and persistence of governments in collecting the head-tax from immigrant Jews. A batch of manuscripts from Yemen show that the Jews of that far away country were not quite as isolated from world Jewry in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries as historians had assumed. A letter from Maimonides to the scholars of France is strongly reminiscent of the appeals leaders of European Jewry have made in recent years to the Jews of America. The great philosopher is bemoaning the desperate plight of the scattered remnants of Israel and the decline of Jewish scholarship everywhere, and is pleading with French Jewry that theirs is the responsibility to keep the light of Torah from extinction. In a question submitted to R. David ibn Abi Zimra we are informed that part of the Jewish community of Cochin traces its origin to slave girls and Jewish merchants from Turkey, Aden, Yemen, and Caucasus. A collection of letters put together to serve as models of style in letter writing turns out to be a veritable mine of information about Italian Jewry — the controversies over ritual practices that arose in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries between the immigrant Rabbis from Germany and Spain and the native Italian rabbinate, the educational system and methods of instruction, the Rabbis who served as mentors and tutors in the homes of the affluent, and the personal strife and jealousies among spiritual leaders and heads of academies. A polemical manuscript, concerned with refuting Christian interpretations



of Biblical passages, contains a list of countries aiming to prove the universality of the belief in one God and another recording the names of men who had participated in the discovery of America. A far richer harvest is stored away in the aforementioned *A History of the Jewish People*, which for new and authentic information, compactness, and objectivity, remains after a score of years the one volume classic in Jewish historiography.

We must conclude but have not done. We should have related Dr. Marx' experiences as a soldier in the German army and as a teacher in a Hebrew school where he excited disapprobation for teaching history too critically. We should have explained why the vow of his pious parents was not kept and why he never did become a Rabbi. We should have spoken of his code of ethics and the effect it has had on his career when, for example, he refused to take a position at the Berlin Seminary because his father was a trustee there. We should have stressed the fact that, despite his quenchless thirst for knowledge and his great capacity for work, he has never been a recluse scholar oblivious of the tensions of the day. We could have pointed out, to the contrary, that he has been alert and responsive to contemporary problems and communal needs; that he had been active in Zionism at one time and a delegate to the Congress in 1905; that he has served energetically various academic and educational bodies and more particularly the United Synagogue of America. We should have given greater prominence to his absolute objectivity as historian and biographer, strikingly exemplified in his not suppressing the obscure view of the physician Adu'l-Latif that represents Maimonides as a man of great merits but tainted by ambition and excessively ready to cater to the great. We should have inquired into his general philosophy and point of view in Judaism; concerning, on the one hand, his rigorous scientific methods that have restrained him from ever warping the evidence to his purpose or indulging in inferences of doubtful validity or filling the chasms of knowledge with conjecture and homilies or degenerating into the partisan of a system, and, on the other, his meticulous observance of the ceremonies and customs of his people and his zealous

advocacy of tradition as the ally of permanence and stability; concerning his conviction that just as the civilization surrounding us has not had its beginnings with the birth of our generation so too has not all the wisdom essential to its direction, transformation, and advancement sprung fresh from the brow of present day innovators, but has roots that reach deeper than do our novel and favorite theories; concerning his affirmation of the Galut generally and his faith in American Jewry particularly.

These matters might be indefinitely extended and should most certainly be dealt with at greater length. But we have long ago exceeded the limits of this paper and must perforce remain satisfied with this hasty sketch of the man of the book, his intellectual endowments and natural propensity, the influences that molded him and the love that has sustained him, the fields he plowed and the plenteous harvest he has reaped. More than half a century has rolled by since he devoured the books in the Koenigsberg library; his hair has grayed, his face wrinkled, his whole body is probably over-taxed and tired. He no longer jumps three or four stairs at a time, nor does he any longer lift children to his full height. But his spirit remains unaged and the ardor of his romance uncooled. He is still searching, annotating and expounding fragments of manuscripts and incunabula, and arranging and classifying the cumbrous and unwieldy masses of bibliographies, journals, reprints, and monographs, rising everywhere about his home abruptly like mountains—with tender feelings, eloquent interest, and impassioned concentration. Only yesterday the postman delivered at our door the most recent issue of the *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, where we found the master once again exhibiting with joy and pride the treasures of the Genizah and accentuating their "importance for Jewish history." For now, as of old, he is pursuing his craft out of love for Israel, out of a keen desire to do what lies in his power toward clarifying its past, ordering its present, and preparing for its future.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE WRITINGS OF PROFESSOR ALEXANDER MARX

By BOAZ COHEN

1898

1. Register to Hoffmann, *Mischnaiot*, Seder Nesikin, IV, Berlin 1898, pp. 377-84.
2. Notes on *Catalogus Librorum Augusti Pfeifferi*, *Z. f. H. B.*, III 1898, 11-13.
3. Review of Ratner, *Seder Olam Rabbah*, Vilna 1897, *Z. f. H. B.*, III, 1898, pp. 68-71.

1899

4. Review of *Chwolson-Festschrift*, Berlin 1899, *O. L. Z.*, II, 1899 197-202, 226-230.
5. Review of Rosenak, *Fortschritte der hebräischen Sprachwissenschaft*, Bremen 1898, *O. L. Z.*, II, 1899, pp. 379-81.

1900

6. Quelques notes sur le Meghillat Taanit, *R. E. J.*, XLI, 1900, pp. 266-268.
7. Review of Bischoff, *Kritische Geschichte der Talmud-uebersetzungen*, Frankfurt 1899, *O. L. Z.*, III, 1900, 133-36.
8. Review of Bacher, *Die aelteste Terminologie*, 1899, *O. L. Z.*, III, 1900, 257-63, 295-99.
9. Review of Zettersteen, *Verzeichnis der HSS zu Upsala 1900*, *O. L. Z.*, III, 1900, 380-82, cf. IV, 31.
10. Review of Poppelauer, *Die juedische Tradition*, Berlin 1900, *O. L. Z.*, III, 1900, 463-4.
11. Review of Gruenhut. *Sefer ha-Likkutim*, Vol. III, Jerusalem, 1899, *Z. f. H. B.*, Vol. IV, 1900, pp. 98-101.



12. Review of Praetorius, *Das Targum zu Josua*, Berlin, 1899, *Z. f. H. B.*, IV, 1900, pp. 110–11.
13. Review of Ginsburger, *Das Fragmententhargum*, Berlin 1899, *Z. f. H. B.*, IV, 136–7.

## 1901

14. Review of Chajes, H. P., *Beitraege zur nordsemitischen Onomathologie*, Vienna 1901, *O. L. Z.*, IV, 1901, 358.
15. Review of Hartmann, *Das Buch Ruth*, Frankfurt, *O. L. Z.*, IV, 1901 497–8.
16. Review of Peritz, *Zwei alte arabische Übersetzungen des Buches Ruth*, Berlin 1900, *O. L. Z.*, IV, 1901, 497–8.
17. Eine Sammelhandschrift im Besitze des Herrn A. Epstein, *Z. f. H. B.*, V, 1901, 54–61.
18. Review of Gruenhut. *Sefer ha-Likkutim*, Vol. IV–V, Jerusalem, 1900 and 1901 in *Z. f. H. B.*, Vol. V, 1901, pp. 99–100.
19. Zur Golah von Daphne *O. L. Z.*, IV, 1901, pp. 233–35.
20. Halak-schaffen *O. L. Z.* IV, pp. 337–38 but cf. ib. p. 380.

## 1902

21. Review of Theodor, *Bereshit Rabba*, *Israelitische Monatschrift*, 1902, No. 7, pp. 25–26, Erste Lieferung, *Z. f. H. B.*, VI, 1902, 67.
22. Review of Kroner, *Maimonides Kommentar zum Traktat Pesachim*, Frankfurt, 1901, *O. L. Z.*, V 1902, 201–4.
23. Review of Buber, *Midrasch Echa Rabbati*, *O. L. Z.*, V., 1902, 293–5.
24. Review of Buber, *Yalkut Machiri zu den Psalmen*, *O. L. Z.*, V., 1902, 295–296.
25. Review of Buber, *Menahem ben Salomon Sechel Tob*, I–II *O. L. Z.*, V., 1902, 296–7.
26. Review of Friedmann, *Seder Eliahu Rabba*, Vienna 1900, *Z. f. H. B.*, VI, 1902, 3–5.
27. Nachtrag zu der Zusammenstellung der Citate aus Targum Jeruschalmi bei Ginsburger, *Das Fragmententhargum*, pp. 91–122, *Z. f. H. B.* VI, 1902, 55–58.

28. Review of Weikert, *Israeli, Jesod Olam*, IV, 18, Rome 1901, *Z. f. H. B.* VI, 1902, 101.
29. Review of Gruenhut, *Yalkut ha-Makiri to Proverbs*, Jerusalem 1902, *Z. f. H. B.* VI, 1902, 102-3.
30. Review of Epstein, *Le Retour de Rab en Babylonie*, Paris 1902, *Z. f. H. B.* VI, 1902, 134-136.
31. Notes in Steinschneider, *Die arabische Literatur der Juden*, Frankfurt 1902, pp. 338-348.

### 1903

32. *Seder Olam* (Cap. 1-10) nach Handschriften und Druckwerken herausgegeben und erklärt. Berlin 1903. XXXIV + 35 + 21 pp.
33. Untersuchungen zum Siddur des Gaon R. Amram, I. Die handschriftliche Ueberlieferung, 28 + 38 pp. reprinted from *Jahrbuch der Jüdische Literarische Gesellschaft* V. 1903, pp. 341-68, Hebrew part. 1-38.
34. Dr. Berliner als Raschiforscher, *Jüdische Presse*, Berlin 1903, No. 20, pp. 221-2.
35. Review of Buttenwieser, *Outline of Neo-Hebraic Apocalyptic literature*, Cincinnati 1901, *O. L. Z.*, V, 1902, 68-72.
36. Review of Behrens, *Moses ben Maimon's Mischnah-kommentar zum Traktat Megilla*, *O. L. Z.*, V, 1902, 201-204.
37. Review of Ginsburger, *Pseudo-Jonathan*, Berlin 1903, *O. L. Z.*, VI, 1903, 123-29.
38. Review of Friedlaender, *Sprachgebrauch des Maimonides*, Frankfurt 1902, *O. L. Z.*, VI, 1903, 165-167.
39. Review of Gaster, *History of Ancient Synagogue*, London, 1901, *Z. f. H. B.*, VII, 1903, 8-10.
40. Review of Gruenhut. *Sefer ha-Likkutim*, Vol. VI, Jerusalem, 1903, in *Z. f. H. B.*, Vol. VII, 1903, p. 44.
41. Review of Perles, F. *Zur Geschichte der Abbreviaturen*, Berlin 1902. *Zur Erklärung der Psalmen Salomo's*, Berlin, 1902, *Z. f. H. B.*, VII, 1903, 52-53.
42. Bibliographische Miscellen: I Eine Schulausgabe des Traktats Berakot, Saloniki 1841; II Eine unbekannte Talmudausgabe, Konstantinopel 1715-16; III Die Son-

- cino-Haggada und das Sidorello 1486; IV Joshua Segré; V Zu Sambari's Chronik, *Z. f. H. B.* VII, 1903, 56–8, 92–3, 190
43. Nachtrag (zu Steinschneider, *Abbreviaturen. Z. f. H. B.* VII, 92–94) *Z. f. H. B.*, VII, 1903, p. vii.
44. Register to Berliner, *Beitraege zur Geschichte der Raschikommentare*, Berlin 1903, pp. 49–50.

## 1905

45. Bibliographische Miscellen (About Petach Enayim, Amsterdam 1764), p. 30; Zwei unbekannte Ausgaben des Traktats Gittin, p. 31; Moses Franchetta aus Montpellier, Selihah Jafa, 1737, p. 61; Siddur mit Spanischer Uebersetzung, Konstantinopel 1739 p. 61; Zwei Ausgaben des Midrasch Rabba, Venedig 1545? pp. 61–62; (Notes on Aaron ben Joseph, Hiddushe Ha-Reah), p. 62; (Notes on Kobez Debarim Nehmadim, Husiatyn 1902,) pp. 62–63; Beth Tefilla, Salonik 1582, p. 96; Seder Nakon, Mantua 1667, 1740, p. 96; Ma'aseh Asarah Haruge Malkut, Constantinople, ca. 1520, p. 123; Behinat Olam, Constantinople ca. 1520, p. 123–4; Toldot Yitshak, Salonika 1571, p. 124; Sicilische Hoschanot, 1628, 1766, 1877, pp. 124–125; Mahzor Catalonia, pp. 125–6; Seder Abodah von Menachem Azarja, Venedig 1583, p. 126; Seder Abodat ha-Mikdash zwischen 1619 and 1622, p. 126; Tikkun Bakaschat Anshe Ma'amad, Mantua 1621, p. 126; Maareket Elijah, 1654, p. 126; Tsidduk ha-Din u-Bakashot, Venedig 1661, p. 127; Hilkot Shehita bekitsur, s. l. e. a., p. 127; Selihot, Cracow 1665, p. 189; Selihot le-yom Sheni be-Adar 1613, p. 190; Mahzor, Prag, 1522–25, p. 191; Sefardische Siddurim, Verona 1648, p. 191; Eliezer Aschenazi, Selihot, Prag 1618, p. 191 *Z. f. H. B.* Vol. IX, 1905.
46. Correcturen zum Seder Troyes, *Z. f. H. B.* IX, 1905, 143–8.
47. Review of Steinschneider, *Geschichtsliteratur*, Frankfurt 1905, *Z. f. H. B.*, IX, 1905, 139–141.



48. Notes in Steinschneider, *Die Geschichtsliteratur der Juden*, I, Frankfurt 1905, p. X and p. 172.
49. חלופי גרסאות ותקונים, במכילתא דרבי שמעון בן יוחאי, הוצאת האפפמאן פראנקפורט א. מ. תרס"ה. עמוד .XIV-XVI

1906

50. Note to Gottheil, *Some Hebrew MSS*, in Cairo, *J. Q. R.* XVIII, 1906, pp. 567-70.
51. Notes to Cowley, "*Bodleian Genizah Fragments*" *J. Q. R.* XVIII, 1906 pp. 768-71.
52. Review of Brody-Albrecht, *Neu-hebräische Dichterschule*, Leipzig 1905, *O. L. Z.*, IX, 1906, 158-61.
53. Jakob Markaria *Z. f. H. B.*, X, 1906, 94.
54. Bemerkungen zu Steinschneider's *Hebräische Uebersetzungen des Mittelalters*, *Z. f. H. B.* X, 1906, 95.
55. Review of *Catalogue de la Bibliothèque de feu Jules de Chantepie du Dezert*, Paris 1905, *Z. f. H. B.*, X, 1906, 138-9.
56. Zusätze und Berichtigungen zu Steinschneider's *Geschichtsliteratur der Juden*, *Z. f. H. B.* X, 1906, 149-165.
57. Samuel ibn Motot und al-Batljusi, *Z. f. H. B.*, X, 1906, 175-78.
58. Zu Daniel Bomberg, *Z. f. H. B.* X, 1906, 188-89.
59. Review of Liber, *Rashi, American Hebrew*, Dec. 7, 1906, Literary Supplement, p. VI-VIII.

1907

60. Italienische Statuten. *Z. f. H. B.*, Vol. XI, 1907, pp. 112-21; XV, 1911, pp. 139-45.
61. Miscelle, Siddur Spagnuolo, Venedig, *Z. f. H. B.*, XI, 1907, 63-64.
62. Bibliographische Miscellen; Ueber das Erdbeben in Livorno, 1742; Ascher ben Jechiel, Orhot Hayyim, Fano 1503; Pentateuch s. l. e. a.; Sefer ha-Goralot, Ferrara 1556; Seder Tefillot, Dyhernfurth, 1692; Tefillah, Mantua 1701:

Reashim u-Reamim, Constantinopel 1716, *Z. f. H. B.* XI, 1907, 123-4.

63. Professor Moritz Steinschneider, *American Hebrew*, February 1, 1907, pp. 323-4.

#### 1908

64. The Expulsion of the Jews from Spain. *J. Q. R.* XV, 1908, pp. 240-71 (Additions and corrections *J. Q. R.*, N.S., II, 257-258) Reprinted in *Studies in Jewish History and Booklore*, 77-106.
65. Eine unbekannte Inkunabel, *Z. f. H. B.*, XII, 1908, 15-16.
66. Bemerkungen zu Druckerein in Constantinopel und Saloniki, *Z. f. H. B.*, XII, 1908, 29.
67. Review of Davidson, *Parody in Jewish Literature*, New York 1907, *R. E. J.* LVII, 1908, 314-318.
68. מילואים לרשימת הספרים שנדפסו בחגורמה  
עד שנת ר"פ: בדברי ימי ישראל בחגורמה מאת  
רואנים. חרס"ח, עמ' 231.
69. Ein von Elia Levita besorgte Ausgabe des sefardischen Siddur. Venice 1543. *Z. f. H. B.* XII, 1908. 29-30.

#### 1909

- 69a. Sur le Kitab Al-Tarikh de Saadia, *R. E. J.*, LVIII, 1909, 299-301.
70. R. Isaac ben Abraham de Narbonne, *R. E. J.*, LVIII, 1909, 301-303.
71. Review of Markon, *Das Buch von den verbotenen Verwandtschaftsgraden des Jeschua ben Jehuda*, St. Petersburg, 1908, *O. L. Z.*, XII, 1909, 411-415.
72. Review of Markon, *Ueber das Machzor Kaffa*, St. Petersburg, 1909, *O. L. Z.*, XII, 1909, 448-9.
73. Review of Hoelscher, *Geschichte der Juden in Palaestina*, St. Petersburg, 1909, *O. L. Z.*, XII, 1909, 448-9.
74. Review of Poznanski, *Studien zur gaonaeischen Epoche*, Warsaw 1909, *Z. f. H. B.*, XIII, 1909, 70-73.
75. Review of Poznanski, *Esquisse historique sur les juifs de Kairouan*, Warsaw, 1909, *Z. f. H. B.*, XIII, 1909, 73-74.

76. Review of Ginzberg, *Geonica I-II*, New York 1909, *Z. f. H. B.*, XIII, 1909, 165-75, cf. also XV, 1911, 127.
77. Miscellen (on Isaiah di Trani), *Z. f. H. B.*, XIII, 188-9.
78. Bemerkungen (contains also remarks on Berliner's *Dichter der 13 Glaubensartikel*), *Z. f. H. B.*, XIII, 1909, 191, cf. also XV, 1911, 127.
79. חלופי גרסאות וחקונים: במדרש תנאים' הוצאת האפפמאן ברלין, 1909. עמ' 62-253.
80. Review of Poznanski, *Karaite Literary Opponents of Saadia*, London 1908, *O. L. Z.*, XII, 1909 pp. 271-2.

# 1910

81. Studies in Gaonic History and Literature. Parts I-IV, *J. Q. R.*, N. S., Vol. I, 1910, pp. 61-104. Part II reprinted in *Studies in Jewish History and Booklore*, pp. 3-8.
82. Review of Pereferkowitsch's edition of *Berakot*, St. Petersburg, 1909, *J. Q. R.*, N. S., I, 1910, 279-85.
83. Review of *Harkavy Festschrift*, St. Petersburg, 1908, *J. Q. R.*, N. S., I, 1910, 425-445.
84. R. Abraham b. David et R. Zerahya Ha-Levi, *R. E. J.*, LIX, 1910, 200-224.
85. Review of Klein, *Beitraege zur Geographie Galilaeas*, Leipzig 1909, *O. L. Z.*, XIII, 1910, 501-3.
86. Bemerkungen zu: *Deutsche Abschreiber und Punktatoren des Mittelalters*, *Z. f. H. B.*, XIV, 1910, 31.
87. Die Ausgaben des Me'am Loez *Z. f. H. B.*, XIV, 1910, 80-82.
88. Review of Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, V, 4th edition, Leipzig 1909, *Z. f. H. B.*, XIV, 1910, 136-9, and *Israelitischer Lehrer und Kantor*, 1909, No. 11, p. 43.
89. Bibliographische Miscellen, *Z. f. H. B.* XIV, 1910, 123-5; 159; Seder Tahanunim u. Selihot, Minhag Italiani, pp. 123-4; Pirke R. Eliezer ha-Gadol, p. 124; Sefer Toldot Yehiel Hefets, p. 124; Sha'ar Pithe Lebanon, pp. 124-5; Sefer Zikaron be-Yerushalayim, p. 125; Seder Tehinah, Minhag Ashkenaz be-ir Verona, p. 159; Seder Tefillat Holim, p. 159.



90. Review of Lewin, *Prolegomena zu einer neuen Ausgabe vom Sendschreiben des R. Scherira Gaon*, Frankfurt 1910, *Z. f. H. B.* XIV, 1910, 140-144.
91. The work of the Mekize Nirdamim, *American Hebrew*, May 13, 1910, p. 34.

## 1911

92. Neue Texte des Seder Tannaim we-Amoraim, *Lewy-Festschrift*, Breslau 1911, pp. 392-99, Hebrew part; 155-72.
93. Review of Strack, *Abodah Zarah, Sanhedrin-Makkoth*, Leipzig, 1909, *J. Q. R.*, N. S., II, 1911, 143-48.
94. Review of Margoliouth. *Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan MSS. in the British Museum*, Part III, Section I, London, 1909, in *J. Q. R.*, N. S., Vol. II, 1911, p. 259-265.
95. Review of *Mishnah*, published by Romm, Vilna 1908-9, *J. Q. R.*, N. S., II, 1911, 266-270.
96. Review of Staerk, *Altjuedische Liturgische Gebete*, O. L. Z., XIV, 1911, 261-2.
97. Review of Staerk, *Der Mischnahtraktat Berakoth*, Bonn 1910, O. L. Z., XIV, 1911, 262-4.
98. Le Commentaire de R. Nissim sur Beça, Taanit et Meguilla *R. E. J.*, LXI, 1911, 130-133.
99. Le poème final du commentaire de Kinnim d'Abraham ben David, *R. E. J.* LXI, 1911, 133.
100. Le Faux Messie Ascher Laemlein, *R. E. J.*, LXI, 1911, 135-8.
101. Nachtrag zu den spanischen Kopisten, *Z. f. H. B.*, XV, 1911 26-7.
102. Deutsche Kopisten aus Handschriften des "Jewish Theological Seminary of America," *Z. f. H. B.* XV, 1911, 95.
103. Nachtraege zu: *Die hebräischen Pergamentdrucke*, *Z. f. H. B.* XV, 1911, 186-7.
104. Notes in Toledano, *Ner Ha-Maarov*, Jerusalem 1911, pp. 108, 221, 224-9, 248.

## 1912

105. Societies for the Promotion of the Study of Jewish History, *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society*, 20, 1912, pp. 1-9.

## 1913

106. Biblical Manuscripts and Books in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary (mostly from the Sulzberger collection) exhibited at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, held at the Seminary, Dec. 29-30, 1913. New York 1913, 11 pp.
107. Additions et Rectifications (Note on MSS. of Pesikta on Vezot Haberacha), *R. E. J.* LXV, 1913, p. 160.
108. Le séjour d'Azoulai a Paris. Paris 1913, with Liber 32 pp. *R. E. J.* LXV, 1913, pp. 243-73.
109. Christliche Hebraisten *Z. f. II. B.*, XVI, 1913, 57-59.
110. ספר המכתם לר' דוד בר לוי. עם רשימה מחדושי הראשונים שנמצאו בכ"י באוצר הספרים של בית המדרש הרבנים בנויארק. ב"הצופה מארץ הנר" שנה נ'. תרע"ג. עמוד 57-61.
111. חלופי נסחאות בברי' דמזלות מכת'י שבאקספרד: בספר "אוצר מדרשים כתבייד" חלק א'. מאת ש. א. ווערטהיימער. ירושלם, תרע"ג, עמוד 13-16.
112. Berliner, *Gesammelte Schriften, I, Italien*, Frankfurt 1913, with A. Freimann (Schechter's and Steinschneider's additions, pp. 221-232, collected also by Prof. A. Marx).

## 1914

113. Die Kelale ha-Talmud des R. Bezalel Aschkenazi nach der einzigen Handschrift des New Yorker Rabbinerseminars herausgegeben. Berlin 1914, *Hoffmann-Festschrift*, Berlin 1914, pp. 289-302, Hebr. 170-217.
114. Biblical manuscripts and Rare Prints (mostly from the Sulzberger collection) in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary (Exhibited at the celebration of the completion of the Bible revision Tuesday, February 10, 1914) (New York 1914) 15 pp.

115. What our Library offers to our students, *Students Annual of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*, I, 1914, pp. 218-26.

## 1915

116. Review of Wachstein, *Bibliothek der israelitischen Kultus-gemeinde*, Wien, I-II, Vienna 1911-4, *J. Q. R.*, N. S., VI, 1915, 167-173.
117. Review of Margoliouth. *Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan MSS. in the British Museum*, Part III. Sections II-VII, London 1912, in *J. Q. R.*, N. S., VI, 1915, p. 163-7.
118. Review of Schwab, *Le manuscrit hebreu*, No. 1408, *J. Q. R.*, N. S., VI. 1915, pp. 173-6.
119. Review of Tisserant, *Specimina Codicum Orientalium*, Bonn 1914, *J. Q. R.*, N. S., VI, 1915, 176-84.
120. Review of Freidus, *The New York Public Library List of Works Relating to the history and condition of the Jews in various countries*. New York 1914. *Z. f. H. B.*, XVIII, 1915, 13-15.

## 1916

121. Review of Margoliouth, *Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan MSS. in the British Museum*, Part III, Sections VIII-IX, London, 1915, *J. Q. R.*, N. S., VII, 1916, p. 123-39.
122. A Description of Bills of Exchange 1559, *American Economic Review*, Vol. VI, 1916, pp. 609-14. Reprinted in *Studies in Jewish History and Booklore*, 167-173.
123. Review of Strack, *Abot*, Leipzig 1915, *J. Q. R.*, N. S., VI, 1916, 423-432.
124. The Jewish Scholarship of Joseph Jacobs, *American Hebrew*, February 11, 1916, p. 382. Reprinted in *Studies in Jewish Biography*, pp. 251-254 and in *Studies in Jewish History and Booklore*, pp. 396-399.
125. Letter to Prof. Deutsch at the 25th Anniversary at the Hebrew Union College, *Hebrew Union College Monthly*, II, May 8, 1916, pp. 257-8.



## 1917

126. Bibliographical Notes on Plague Tractates, *Annals of Medical History*, December 1917, Vol. I, No. 4, 432-33.
127. Solomon Schechter, *Publications of the Jewish Historical Society*, 25, 1917, 177-192. Reprinted in *Essays in Jewish Biography*, p. 229-250 and in *Studies in Jewish History and Booklore*, pp. 377-395.
128. Memorial Addresses Delivered on the Occasion of the Second Anniversary of the Death of Dr. Solomon Schechter, November 26, 1917, at the Jewish Theological Seminary, pp. 1-6. Reprinted in *Essays in Jewish Biography*, p. 229-250 and in *Studies in Jewish History and Booklore*, pp. 377-395.
129. Professor Solomon Schechter's Relation to the Seminary, *American Jewish Chronicle*, Vol. IV, No. 5, December 7, 1917.

## 1918

130. Library Report, New York 1918, *Register of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*, New York 1918, 23-24.
131. A Seventeenth Century Autobiography. A Picture of Jewish Life in Bohemia and Moravia from a Manuscript in the Jewish Theological Seminary, *J. Q. R.*, N. S., VIII, 1918, 269-304. The Hebrew Text was reprinted in "*Dabar*," Vol. II, 1927, No. 39, pp. 1-3. English translation reprinted in *Jewish Exponent*, April 5, 1918, pp. 1, 8, and in *Studies in Jewish History and Booklore*, pp. 178-197.
132. Review of James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Library of St. John's College*, Cambridge, 1913, *J. Q. R.*, N. S., IX, 1918, p. 253-58.
133. Aims and Tasks of Jewish Historiography. *Publications of the Jewish Historical Society*, New York 1918, No. 26, pp. 11-32.

## 1919

134. A List of Poems on the Articles of Creed, *J. Q. R.*, N. S., II, 1919, 305-36.
135. Number of Letters in the Pentateuch, *J. B. L.* 38, 1919, pp. 24-29.
136. Aldus and the first use of Hebrew Type in Venice, *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, XIII, 1919, pp. 64-67.
137. Review of Lewin, *Milekufat ha-Geonim*, I, Jaffa 1916, *Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosophy*, 1919, I, 397-401.
138. Library report, *Register of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*, New York 1919, 24-26.

## 1920

139. Review of Paetow, *Guide to Mediaeval History*, Berkley 1917, *J. Q. R.*, N. S., X, 1920, 529-534.
140. Review of Cassuto, *Incunaboli Ebraici a Firenze*, Florence 1912, *J. Q. R.*, N. S., XI, 1920, 98-112.
141. Review of Rosenthal, *Hebraeische Inkunabelnkatalog 151*, Munich, *J. Q. R.*, N. S., XI, 1920, 112-115.
142. Review of Cassuto, *Gli studi giudaici in Italia*, part I, Rome 1913, *J. Q. R.*, N. S., XI, 1920, p. 116-119.
143. Review of Adler, *Gazetteer of Hebrew Printing*, London 1917, *J. Q. R.*, N. S., XI, 1920, 265-276.
144. Additions et Rectifications (Notes on Sefer Zerubabel), *R. E. J.* LXXI, 1920, p. 222.
145. Israel Friedlaender. Zionist and Scholar. *Maccabean*, August, 1920, pp. 33-35.
146. Israel Friedlaender, The Scholar, *Menorah Journal*, Vol. VI, 1920, pp. 344-50, reprinted in *Essays in Jewish Biography*, pp. 280-289 and in *Studies in Jewish History and Booklore*, pp. 400-408.
147. Library Report, in the *Register of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*, New York 1920, 28-35.
148. Review of Shapiro, Modern and Contemporary European History, *Maccabean*, February 1920, pp. 71-72.

## 1921

149. Haggadahs as Works of Art, *United Synagogue Recorder*, vol. I, no. 2, p. 7.
150. An Aramaic Fragment of the Wisdom of Solomon. *Journal of Biblical Literature*. 40, 1921, pp. 57-69.
151. מאמר על שנת נאו"ה. יוצא לאור מתוך פי' אבות כ"י. בהצופה לחכמת ישראל' שנה ה'. בוראפעשט, הרפ"א, עמ' 194-202.
152. Library Report, *Register of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*, New York 1921. 28-33.
153. Ancient Jewish Manuscripts. *The Talmud Magazine*, Boston, Aug. 1921, p. 47-49.
154. The Rabbi as a Student, *Seminary Bulletin*, Vol. I. No. 3, June 1921.

## 1922

155. Marcus Brann in *Publications of the Jewish Historical Society*, New York, 1922, 28, pp. 261-65.
156. Moritz Guedemann, in *Publications of the Jewish Historical Society*, New York 1922, No. 28, pp. 276-81.
157. Prof. Dr. David Hoffmann, *U. S. R.*, Vol. II, Jan. 1922, 2-4. Reprinted in *Studies in Jewish History and Literature*, pp. 369-376.
158. Zu I. Gross' Artikel "Rochade und Notation bei Ibn Ezra" *M. G. W. J.* 66, 1922, pp. 158-9.
159. Additions et Rectifications (Note on Saadia) *R. E. J.*, 74, 1922, p. 222.
160. Place de Daniel dans le Canon d'après les Rabbins, *R. E. J.*, LXXV, 1922, 93-94. Reprinted in English in *Studies in Jewish History and Booklore*, pp. 1-2.
161. Samuel Poznanski, Paris 1922, *R. E. J.*, LXXIV, 1922, pp. 169-83. תורגם לעברית ע"י ד"ר י. ליפקין. נדפס ב"ספר זכרון" לכבוד פוזננסקי. ורשה, תרפ"ז, עמוד ט"ז-ז'.
162. Bibliographie de Toutes les Ouvrages et articles du Dr. Samuel Poznanski. With Edward Poznanski, *R. E. J.*, Vol. LXXIV, 1922, pp. 184-208. Corrected, augmented



and reprinted in *Livre d'Hommage à la Mémoire du Dr. Poznanski*, Warsaw, 1927, pp. XXIX–XLVII.

163. מאמר ע"ד החלופים במאה הט"ז. פרק מס' חיי עולם לר' יחיאל נסים מפיסא. נדפס ב.הצופה לחכמת ישראל" שנה ה' בודאפעשט, תרפ"ב, עמ' 19–23.
164. Library Report, *Register of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*, New York 1922, pp. 30–35.

## 1923

165. Review of Strack, *Einleitung in Talmud*, Munich 1921 *J. Q. R.*, N. S., XIII, 1923, 352–365.
166. Review of *Haggadah edited by Eisenstein*, New York, 1920, *J. Q. R.*, N. S., XIII, 1923, 513–516. Reprinted in *Studies in Jewish History and Booklore*, pp. 271–276.
167. Review of *Haggadah edited by Budko*, Vienna 1921, *J. Q. R.*, N. S., XIII, 1923, 516–20.
168. Review of Oesterley and Box. *A Survey of the Literature of Judaism*, London 1920, *J. Q. R.*, N. S., XIV, 1923, 275–280.
169. Briefe Simonsen's an Halberstam in *Festschrift Simonsen*, 1923, pp. 161–71.
170. Brief zu Prof. Simonsen's siebzigstem Geburtstag, *Israeliten*, Copenhagen, March 17, 1923, pp. 12–13.
171. Judge Sulzberger's Scholarship, *Jewish Exponent*, April 27, 1923, p. 8.
172. A Plea for Jewish Learning. In *Ohab Zedek, First Hungarian Congregation. The Golden Jubilee Celebration*, 1923, Reprinted in *U. S. R.*, Vol. IV, 1924, No. 1, Jan. pp. 5–6.
173. The Seminary Library's Great Accession. The Elkan Adler Collection. *United Synagogue Recorder*, Vol. III, No. 2, April 1923, pp. 6–7.
174. The Significance of The Seminary Library, *Jewish Tribune*, October 5, 1923, pp. 10, 32.
175. Tribute to the late A. S. Freidus, *American Hebrew*, October 19, 1923, p. 607.
176. Notiz (on Karab, Megillah 10b) *Jeschurun*, Vol. X, 1923, p. 180.

177. תרנום האפוריסמים של איפוקרטס ליעקב אבן זכרא. ב,דביר" ספר ב'. תרפ"ג, עמוד 108-12.
178. Library Report, *Register of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*, New York 1923, pp. 30-39.

#### 1924

179. Glimpses of the Life of an Italian Rabbi of the First Half of the Sixteenth Century (David Ibn Yahya) in the *Hebrew Union College Annual* 1924, I. pp. 605-24. Reprinted without the Hebrew text in *Studies in Jewish History and Booklore*, pp. 155-166.
180. Some Notes on the Use of Hebrew Type in non-Hebrew Books 1475-1520 in *Bibliographical Essays. A Tribute to Wilberforce Eames*, 1924, pp. 381-408. Reprinted in *Studies in Jewish History and Booklore*, pp. 296-345.
181. Review of Halper, *Post-Biblical Hebrew Literature*, I-II, Philadelphia, 1921, *J. Q. R.*, N. S., XIV, 1924, 341-48.
182. Library Report. *Register of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*, New York 1924, pp. 25-39.
183. The Life of Mathilde Schechter. In *Memoriam Mrs. Solomon Schechter*, 1924, pp. 23-29. Reprinted in *U. S. R.*, Vol. V, 1925, No. 1, pp. 11-12.
184. Foreword to Finkelstein, *Jewish Self-Government*, New York 1924, XI-XIII.
185. Notiz (on R. Akibah. Berakot 61b), Vol. XI, *Jeschurun*, 1924, pp. 627-8.
186. Editor of Schechter, *Studies in Judaism*, Third Series, Philadelphia 1924, with Frank I. Schechter.
187. ששה משלים בענין העולם הזה והבא. ברלין תרפ"ד, עמ' 17.

#### 1925

188. Mayer Sulzberger in *Publications of the Jewish Historical Society*, No. 29, New York, 1925, pp. 188-93. Reprinted in *Essays in Jewish Biography*, pp. 223-228.
189. Tribute to Dr. Malter. *Jewish Exponent*, April 10, 1925, p. 10.

190. Editor of Steinschneider, *Gesammelte Schriften*, herausgegeben von Heinrich Malter und Alexander Marx, I. Gelehrten-Geschichte, 1925.
191. Review of Davidson, *Thesaurus of Mediaeval Hebrew Poetry*, Vol. I, N. Y. 1924, U. S. R., Vol. V, No. 1, 1925, pp. 18-19.
192. הצופה לחכמת ישראל. (דבר אל הקוראים העברים) בהדאר" שנה ד'. תרפ"ה, עמוד 7.
193. שלש תשובות לרב יוסף גאון מתא מחסיא. נדפס "בגנוי קדם" ספר ג'. ערוך ע"י ב"מ לוין. חיפה, תרפ"ה, עמ' 57-66.
194. הערות. רשימה חדשה מספרים וכתבי יד. בקרית ספר". שנה ב'. ירושלים, תרפ"ה. עמ' 157-159.
195. Library Report, *Register of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*, New York 1925, pp. 127-139.

## 1926

196. The Correspondence Between the Rabbis of Southern France and Maimonides about Astrology, 52 pp. reprinted from *Hebrew Union College Annual*, III, 1926, pp. 311-358. Additions and Corrections pp. 53-54, *ibid.* IV, pp. 483-4. 2 chapters reprinted without the Hebrew Text in *Studies in Jewish History and Booklore*, pp. 48-76.
197. Review of Schwarz, *Die hebraeischen Handschriften in Wien*, Leipzig, 1925, *J. Q. R.*, N. S., XVI, 1926, pp. 337-42.
198. Review of *Haggadah of Gerschon Kohen*, edited by Katz and Loewe. Berlin 1926, *J. Q. R.*, N. S., XVI, 1926, 471-472.
199. Review of *Haggadah* edited by Back, Paris 1925, *J. Q. R.*, N. S., XVI, 1926, 472-474.
200. Some Notes on the History of David Oppenheimer's Library, *R. E. J.* LXXXII, 451-60. *Mélanges offerts à M. Israel Lévi*, Paris, 1926. Reprinted in *Studies in Jewish History and Booklore*, pp. 238-255.
201. מכתב שלישי לר' עובדיה מברטנורא. בספר השנה של ארץ-ישראל". שנה ב' ג'. תרפ"ו, עמ' 97-99.



202. Henry Malter, *American Jewish Yearbook*, Vol. 28, 1926, pp. 261-272. Reprinted in *Essays in Jewish Biography*, pp. 255-264 and in *Studies in Jewish History and Booklore*, pp. 409-417.
203. The Books and MSS. of the Seminary Library in the Exhibition of the New York Public Library, in *U. S. R.*, Vol. VI, 1926, No. 3, June 3, pp. 19-21. Die Bücher und Manuscripte des Seminars auf der Ausstellung der New Yorker Stadtbibliothek, in *Soncino Blätter*, Berlin, Vol. II, 1927, pp. 113-116. Cf. no. 209.
204. Literatur über hebräische Inkunablen in *Soncino-Blätter*, Berlin, 1926, pp. 159-169. Reprinted in English in *Studies in Jewish History and Booklore*, pp. 277-295.
205. Library Report, *Register of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*, New York 1926, pp. 127-144.

1927

206. History of the Jewish People, by Max L. Margolis and Alexander Marx, Philadelphia 1927, xxii+823 pp. Translated into French under the title *Histoire du Peuple Juif*, by J. Robillot, Paris, 1930, 750 pp., and into Spanish under the title *Historia del Pueblo Judío*, Buenos Aires, 1945.
207. Gabirol's Authorship of the Choice of Pearls and the Two Versions of Kimhi's Shekel Hakodesh, in *Hebrew Union College Annual*, Vol. IV, 1927, pp. 433-448. Reprinted in *Studies in Jewish History and Booklore*, p. 9-25.
208. Der arabische Bustanai-Bericht und Nathan ha-Babli, *Livre d'hommage à la mémoire du Dr. Poznanski*, Warsaw 1927, pp. 76-81.
209. Die Bücher und Manuskripte des Seminars auf der Ausstellung der New Yorker Stadtbibliothek, in *Soncino Blätter*, Berlin, Vol. II, 1927, pp. 113-116; cf. no. 203.
210. Library Report, *Register Jewish Theological Seminary of America*, New York 1927, pp. 127-158.
211. Review of R. Levy, *The Astronomical Works of Abraham ibn Ezra*, Baltimore, 1927, *Romania LIV*, 1928, p. 136-38.

212. Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century, B. C. E., *American Hebrew*, February 1, 1927.
213. Recent Donations to the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary, *U. S. R.*, Vol. VII, No. 1, 1927, pp. 11-12.
214. Two Aged Jewish Sages, Adolf Schwarz and Moses Gaster, *U. S. R.*, VII, 1927, No. 2, p. 3.
215. מן הגניזה. (מכתב מדמשק אל ר' יוסף בן אליעזר הספרדי) ב"ספר היובל של "הדאר" תרפ"ז, עמ' 9-186.
216. צבי פרץ חיות ז"ל. על קברו. ב"הדאר" כרך ח' שנה ז'. כ"ט כסלו, תרפ"ח. עמוד 114.

## 1928

217. The Darmstadt Haggadah with Notes on Illuminated Haggadah Manuscripts. Reprinted from *J. Q. R.*, N. S., XIX, 1928, p. 1-16. Reprinted in *Studies in Jewish History and Booklore*, pp. 256-270.
218. Review of Avicenna, *de Congelatione et Conglutinatione Lapidum*, being Sections of the *Kitab al-Shifa*, ed. Holmyard and Mandeville. Paris, 1927, *Speculum* III, 1928, p. 596-7.
219. Mr. Bamberger's Donation to the Seminary Library, *U. S. R.*, VIII, February, 1928, No. 1, pp. 13-15.
220. Library Report, *Register of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*, 1928, p. 133-72.
221. Dr. Zebi Perez Chajes, A Tribute, *U. S. R.*, Vol. VIII, 1928, No. 1, pp. 10-11.
222. Zebi Perez Chajes, *Proceedings of the Rabbinical Assembly of America*, II, 1928, p. 183-5.

## 1929

223. Alexander Kohut and his Work. *U. S. R.*, Vol. VIII, 1928, No. 4, pp. 6-7.
224. The Polemical Manuscripts in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, *A. S. Freidus Memorial Volume*, New York, 1929.
225. Arba Turim und Aleppo Mahzor, two new acquisitions

- of the Seminary Library. *U. S. R.*, IX, 2 April 1929, p. 7-8.
226. Various notes to G. Sarton, *History of Science* I, signed A. M. *Isis*, XIII, Sept. 1929, pp. 150-57.
227. ר' שמואל וינר. ב"הדאר" כרך ח'. אפריל 12, 1929, עמ' 8-387.
228. Library Report, *Register of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*, 1929, p. 149-99.
229. Über die ershte hebräische Druken. *Der Tog*, April 18, 1929, p. 9.

# 1930

230. Contribution à l'Histoire des Juifs de Cochin in *R. E. J.*, 89, 1930, 293-304. Reprinted without the Hebrew text in *Studies in Jewish History and Booklore*, 174-177.
231. Eine unbekannte spanische Inkunabel. *Soncino-Blätter*, Berlin Vol. III, 1930, pp. (173-182) 97-106.
232. Library Report, *Register of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*, 1930, p. 155-194.
233. Recent Donations to the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. *U. S. R.*, March 14, 1930, p. 6, 8.
234. מכתב ר' משה מייזעלש לר' אליעזר הלוי [Dr. Loewe], ב"ציון" ספר ד'. ירושלים תר"ץ. עמוד 39-44.
235. Address of Acting President Alexander Marx, December 26, 1928, *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, Vol. I, 1930, pp. 3-6.
236. Greetings to Henrietta Szold, *Hadassah News Letter*, Vol. IX, No. 3, Dec. 1930, p. 3.
237. Extract from a letter on the first dated Hebrew Book, E. Miriam Lone, *Some Noteworthy Firsts in Europe during the Fifteenth Century*, New York, 1930, p. 23-24.
238. Jüdische Namen in Südindien. *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Jüdische Familienforschung*, VI, 3 (Heft 23) Sept. 1930, p. 295.
239. מאמר על הטחורים מאת שלמה אבן איוב



הספרדי מבוא מאת פרופ. א. מארכס. ב, הרופא העברי  
כרך א'. חוב' ב'. ניויורק, תר"צ, עמ' 9-63.

## 1931

240. Adolph S. Oko. A Tribute to his Twenty-Fifth Anniversary. *Hebrew Union College Monthly*, Vol. XVIII, No. 5, April 15, 1931, p. 7.
241. Library Report, *Register of the Jewish Theological Seminary*, 1931, pp. 147-203.
242. Notiz zum Buchbinden der Juden. *Mitteilungen der Soncino Gesellschaft* Nrs. 7-10, March 1931, p. 41.
243. Spinozas Ahnen. *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Jüdische Familienforschung*, VII (Heft 25) March 1931, p. 347.

## 1932

244. A Jewish Cause Célèbre in Sixteenth Century Italy (The Pesakim of 1519), *Abhandlungen zur Erinnerung an Hirsch Perez Chajes*, Vienna 1932, pp. 149-173, Reprinted in *Studies in Jewish History and Booklore*, pp. 107-154.
245. Library Report, *Register of the Jewish Theological Seminary*, 1932, p. 37-40.
246. Jude Michel. *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für Jüdische Familienforschung*. VIII, (Heft 29), March 1932, p. 451.

## 1933

247. A new Collection of Manuscripts. A Recent Acquisition of the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary, *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, IV, 1933, pp. 135-167.
248. Library Report, *Register of the Jewish Theological Seminary*, 1933, p. 40-44.
249. Descendenz von König David. *Mitt. d. Ges. f. Jüd. Fam.* 1933 IX, (Heft 33) p. 538.

250. Review of Adler, *Jewish Travellers*, London, 1930, in *J. Q. R.*, N. S., XXIV, 1933, p. 67-72.
251. Review of A. Z. Schwarz, *Die Hebräischen Handschriften in Österreich, Leipzig 1931* in *J. Q. R.*, N. S., XXIV 1933, 72-80.
252. In Memoriam Max L. Margolis. *Proceedings of the Rabbinical Assembly of America*. Vol. IV, 1933, p. 368-80. Reprinted in *Essays in Jewish Biography*, pp. 265-279 and in *Studies in Jewish History and Booklore*, pp. 418-430.

1934

253. Zunz's Letters to Steinschneider, *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, Vol. V, 1934, pp. 95-153. Partly reprinted in *Studies in Jewish History and Booklore*, pp. 346-363.
254. George Alexander Kohut, New York 1934, *American Jewish Yearbook* 5695, 1934, pp. 55-64.
255. Library Report, *Register of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America* 1934, pp. 77-85.
256. Various notes to G. Sarton, *History of Science* II, signed A. M. *Isis*, XXI, July 1934, p. 355-8.
257. The Late Dr. H. G. Enelow, *New York Times*, Feb. 8, 1934.
258. Texts by and about Maimonides in *J. Q. R.*, N. S., XXV, 1935, pp. 371-428.

1935

259. Ein Verschollener Pergamentdruck Riva di Trento 1560 (Aus den Responsen des R. Moses Provenziale) in *Festschrift für Aron Freimann Zum 60. Geburtstage*. Herausgegeben von Alexander Marx und Hermann Meyer, 1935, pp. 81-88.
260. Library Report, *Register of the Jewish Theological Seminary* 1935, p. 49-60.
261. Moses Maimonides. With an Autograph of Maimonides reproduced from a MS. in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary, New York 1935, 27 pp. Maimonides

- Octocentennial Series II. Reprinted in *Studies in Jewish History and Booklore*, New York, 1944, pp. 26–47, and in *Essays in Jewish Biography*, pp. 87–111.
262. Steinschneideriana II, *Jewish Studies in Memory of George A. Kohut*, New York 1935, pp. 492–527.
263. Co-editor of *Festschrift für Aron Freimann zum 60. Geburtstage*. Herausgegeben von Alexander Marx and Hermann Meyer, Berlin 1935.
264. Co-editor of *Jewish Studies in Memory of George A. Kohut (1874–1933)*. Edited by Salo W. Baron and Alexander Marx, New York 1935.
265. די רמב"ם אוישטעלונג אין מוזעאום פון אידיש טעאלאגישען סעמינאר. די פארשיידענע כתב־יד. (תרגום מכתב־יד ע"י יצחק ריבקינד) „די צוקונפט" באנד 40. נייריארק, אפריל, 1935, זייט 35–233.

## 1936

266. William Wright's Letters to Moritz Steinschneider. *Gaster Anniversary Volume, Occident and Orient*, 1936, pp. 424–438.
267. Library Report, *Register of the Jewish Theological Seminary*, 1936, p. 51–52.

## 1937

268. Library Report, *Register of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*, 1937, p. 65–83.
269. Zwei Briefe Berühmter Gelehrter aus dem 16 Jahrhundert, *Festschrift Jakob Freimann zum 70. Geburtstag*, Berlin, 1937, p. 167–171.
270. Scientific Works of Medieval Jewish Scholars. In the *American Hebrew*, 1937, July 9, p. 6; July 16, p. 6, 13; July 23, p. 10; July 30, p. 10–11, August 6, p. 16, 30; August 13, p. 9. Reprinted with three additional introductory paragraphs in *Essays and Studies in Memory of Linda Miller*, Edited by Israel Davidson, New York, 1938, p. 117–170.
271. Jewish Learning in American Judaism, *Jewish Exponent*, June 4, 1937, p. 1, 7.



- 271a. כתבי יד רפואיים בבית עקד הספרים של הסימניון האמריקאי לרבנים ב"הרופא העברי", ניו יורק, תרצ"ח (1937), עמ' 149-145.

1938

272. Library Report, *Register of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*, 1938, p. 65-80.
273. Review of Katz, *The Jews in the Visigothic and Frankish Kingdoms of Spain and Gaul*. *American Historical Review*, Vol. 43, April 1938, p. 588-9.

1939

274. The Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America in *The Jewish Theological Seminary Semi-Centennial Volume*, New York, 1939, p. 87-120.
275. Library Report, *Register of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*, 1939, p. 61-90.
276. Coleman, Edward D., *A Selected Bibliography of the Writings of Albert M. Friedenberg*. With a Preface by Alexander Marx. Philadelphia, 1939. Reprinted from the *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society* No. 35, pp. 115-118.
277. Samuel, Wilfred S. *Some Notes on the 17th Century London Jews*, *American Historical Review* XLV, No. 1, October 1939, p. 208.
278. Addenda to Cecil Roth's article in *Jewish Journal of Jewish Bibliography*. Vol. I, 1939, p. 100 and 105.

1940

279. Library Report, *Register of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*, 1940, p. 43-81.

1941

280. The Life and Work of Rashi, *Rashi Anniversary Volume*, New York, 1941. Reprinted in *Essays in Jewish Biography*, pp. 61-68.
281. Genizah. *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, IV, 1941, p. 531-33.

282. "הערות למאמר „לקורות הלשון העברית כשפת הלמוד בחכמת הרפואה" ב„לשונונו" כרך י"א (1941) עמ' 61-62.

## 1942

283. Some Notes on the Life of R. Yair Hayyim Bacharach in *Essay presented to J. H. Hertz*. London, 1942, pp. 307-311.
284. Library Report, *Register of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*, 1942, pp. 50-85.

## 1943

285. Preface to Hershman, *Rabbi Isaac ben Sheshet Perfet*. New York, 1943, XI-XII.
286. Jewish Libraries in America, *Menorah Journal*, Vol. XXXI, 1943, pp. 78-82.

## 1944

287. Studies in Jewish History and Booklore, New York, 1944, xiii+458 pp.
288. Rab Saadia Gaon. In *Rab Saadia Gaon, Studies in his Honor*, by Louis Finkelstein, New York, 1944, pp. 53-95. Reprinted in *Essays in Jewish Biography*, pp. 3-38.
289. Library Report, *Register of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*, 1944, p. 77-110.
290. Review of Friedenwald, *The Jews in Medicine*, Baltimore, 1944, *Harofe Haivri*, 1944, II, 144-153. Abridged Hebrew translation l. c. 125-29.
291. Ismar Elbogen: An Appreciation. In Elbogen, *A Century of Jewish Life*, Philadelphia, 1944, pp. xi-xx.
292. מכתב אל העורך. נדפס „בצרון" שנה ה'. חוב' י"א. 1944 עמ' 386.

## 1945

293. ר' יוסף איש ארלי ור' יוחנן טריוויש. בקובץ „מדעי' לזכר משה שור. ניירורק, תש"ה, עמ' 189-219.

## 1946

294. The Choice of Books by the Printers of Incunabula in: "To Dr. R." Philadelphia, 1946, 154-173.
295. ר' יוסף איש ארלי בתור מורה וראש ישיבה בסיינה. בספר היובל לכבוד לוי גינצבורג. חלק עברי. ניויורק, חשו' עמ' רעא'-שד'.
296. An Important Jewish Cultural Anniversary (50th Anniversary of the Discovery of the Genizah), *New York Herald Tribune Weekly Book Review*, Vol. 22, No. 46, July 7, 1946, p. 16.
297. The Hebrew Union College Library. *Hebrew Union College Bulletin*, V, No. 4, May 1946, p. 11.

## 1947

298. Essays in Jewish Biography. Philadelphia, 1947, x+298 pp.
299. The Importance of the Geniza for Jewish History, *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, Vol. XVI, 1947, p. 183-204.
300. Remarks on the Library, *Proceedings of the Rabbinical Assembly of America*, Vol. VIII, New York, 1947, pp. 312-316.

## 1948

301. Address in "Founder's Day," the Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, Philadelphia, 1948, pp. 19-24. Reprinted in *The Torch*, January 1949, pp. 19-23, 40.

## 1949

302. Dr. [Saul] Lieberman's Contribution to Jewish Scholarship, in *Proceedings of the Rabbinical Assembly of America*, vol. XII, 1949, pp. 259-271.



## THE JUDICIAL REFORM OF JEHOSEPHAT

BY W. F. ALBRIGHT

The account of the judicial reform of Jehoshaphat, in II Chron. 19.5-11, has been discarded by nearly all critical historians of Israel since the time of Wellhausen. In his *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* (1878)<sup>1</sup> he declared that it was unhistorical; among his reasons were the role played by the priests and Levites, which he considered anachronistic, and the meaning of the king's name ("It Is Yahweh Who Has Judged"), which suggested an aetiological origin of the story to him. In view, however, of the partial rehabilitation of the Chronicler as a historical witness which we owe to recent archaeological discoveries, it is high time to reëxamine this narrative in the light of our present knowledge. First we must reconsider the narrative from the standpoint of literary and historical criticism of its context in the work of the Chronicler. Then we must study it from a comparative point of view, employing external data from the reservoir accumulated by the archaeologist.

### I. THE LITERARY AND HISTORICAL CHARACTER OF THE CHRONICLER'S WORK

The low opinion of the historical value of the Chronicler's work which prevailed after Wellhausen's acute, but often tendentious criticism reached an all-time low as a result of the work of C. C. Torrey, W. H. Kusters, S. A. Cook, Gustav Hölscher and others.<sup>2</sup> To these scholars the Chronicler was a very inferior novelist, who invented the story of the Restoration from the Captivity and who fabricated the Ezra Memoirs. He wrote in

<sup>1</sup> Third edition, p. 197.

<sup>2</sup> See especially Torrey, *Ezra Studies* (1910); Kusters, *Het Herstel van Israël in het Perzische Tijdvak* (1893); Cook, e. g., in Charles' *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, I, 1-19; Hölscher in Kautzsch-Bertholet, *Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments*, 4th ed., II, 491 ff.

the third century B. C. E. or later; and even his genealogical tables, where they are original with him and do not sound like fabrications, reflect conditions after the Exile and are thus not authentic documents. This is the point of view held by many recent writers, including R. H. Pfeiffer, according to whom (*Introduction to the Old Testament*, 1941, p. 806): "It is an error to consider the Chronicler as a writer of history. It is futile to inquire seriously into the reality of any story or incident not taken bodily from Samuel or Kings. His own contributions should be classed, with the Books of Jonah, Esther, Tobit, Judith, and the like, as historical fiction."

Against this extremely low estimate of the Chronicler archaeological evidence can now be marshalled in increasing abundance. A few illustrations must suffice. To begin with, it must be remembered that the Chronicler followed his Tetrateuchal source<sup>3</sup> in Genesis and occasionally in Exodus and Numbers very closely; differences in the genealogies are virtually always to be explained by the accidents of manuscript transmission. We find the same situation in his very extensive use of the work of the Deuteronomist, especially in Samuel and Kings.<sup>4</sup> From the earlier books of the Deuteronomist he draws, e. g., the list of Levitic towns (I Chron. 6.42 ff. = Josh. 21.13 ff.); the writer has elsewhere shown in detail that the differences between the two recensions are to be explained solely — or almost alone — on the basis of divergent manuscript transmission from a common archetype.<sup>5</sup> The accidents of transmission through copyists will also explain most — not all — of the divergences between the text of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles. The extent to which minor divergences between them are due to post-exilic scribal

<sup>3</sup> For the literary significance of the Tetrateuch as against the great work of the Deuteronomist see M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (1943), who shows that the now traditional "Hexateuch" is just as devoid of literary-historical meaning as the "Pentateuch," while it is totally without the impressive traditional background which the latter possesses.

<sup>4</sup> See Noth's detailed treatment, *op. cit.*, pp. 131 ff. The latest systematic comparison of the two recensions is M. Rehm's *Textkritische Untersuchungen zu den Parallelstellen der Samuel-Königsbücher und der Chronik* (1937).

<sup>5</sup> See "The List of Levitic Cities," in the *Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume, English Section* (1945), pp. 49-73.

schools has been shown by Sperber.<sup>6</sup> It should thus be improbable, *a priori*, that the Chronicler would invent the residue of his compilation. As a matter of fact very few scholars doubt the historicity of the Memoirs of Nehemiah, which were also included by the Chronicler (or an early editor) in his collection.

If we work backward from the latest times, we find the following situation. Archaeological excavations and surveys in Judah have demonstrated overwhelmingly that there was a virtually complete devastation of the country at the time of the Chaldean invasions.<sup>7</sup> Not a single site hitherto excavated in the whole of Judah proper shows continuous occupation through the Exile. This is particularly significant because Bethel, for example, which was well outside the borders of Judah before the Exile and was excavated by the writer, exhibits continuous occupation through the seventh century down at least to the middle of the sixth.<sup>8</sup> There was, accordingly, a thorough-going depopulation, contrary to the views of Torrey and others — and such depopulation had to be followed by a repopulation or there would have been no revival of Judaism in Palestine. In other words, there was a Restoration. In this connection the reader may be reminded that Weidner's discovery of Babylonian archives mentioning King Jehoiachin of Judah and five royal princes,<sup>9</sup> together with many other recent finds, has disposed of Torrey's concrete arguments against the historicity of Ezekiel, which were so timed as to bring almost immediate archaeological refutation.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>6</sup> "Hebrew Based upon Biblical Passages in Parallel Transmission" (*Heb. Union Col. Annual*, XIV, 153-249); cf. *Jour. Bib. Lit.*, LIX, 283 f. (note, however, that Origen's Hexapla has not been systematically used and that for "dialects" one should rather say "scribal schools," without denying a certain dialectal influence).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *Jour. Bib. Lit.*, LI (1932), 103 ff. (followed by a discussion between Torrey and the writer, LI, 179 ff. and 301 ff.); *Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible*, pp. 171 f. Subsequent discoveries have made the writer's position much stronger, without bringing a single exception.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. my *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* (1942), pp. 172 f.

<sup>9</sup> See Ernst F. Weidner in *Mélanges syriens offerts à M. René Dussaud*, II (1939), 923 ff.; the writer in *Biblical Archaeologist*, V, 49-55.

<sup>10</sup> See the writer, *Jour. Bib. Lit.*, LI (1932), 93-101; *Biblical Archaeologist*, V (1942), 54 f. (where striking additional direct disproofs of Torrey's arguments are given).



The discovery of the Elephantine Papyri, followed by many more ostraca and finally by the leather rolls of the Arsames correspondence, all from the fifth century B. C. E., has destroyed the validity of much more of the Kisters-Torrey argument. These documents have established the early date of the Aramaic of Ezra, which differs from that of Elephantine only in spelling (always notoriously subject to revision in ancient times, as well as in modern). They have demonstrated the fallacy of Torrey's attempt to prove a Greek origin for such words as פתגם, which Torrey derived from the Greek poetic word φθέγμα<sup>11</sup> while Cowley thought it was a loan from ἐπίταγμα.<sup>12</sup> However, the word occurs repeatedly in the leather rolls of Arsames from the late fifth century B. C. E., a century before Alexander; since it occurs in such a pure Iranian expression as גסס פתגם, "a bad business," there can be no doubt whatever about its Persian origin.<sup>13</sup> The Elephantine Papyri have also established the date of Nehemiah in the third quarter of the fifth century beyond cavil and have settled many other previously uncertain points in connection with postexilic Jewish history. Not once have they given any support to scholars who impugn the Chronicler's honesty as a compiler. Thanks to the Elephantine archives and to other new documents in Aramaic, combined with objective use of other ancient sources, virtually all concrete objections to the substantial (I do not say "verbal") authenticity of the Edict of Cyrus<sup>14</sup> and the Aramaic edicts in Ezra<sup>15</sup> have been disproved.

Just as an illustration of the miscellaneous new data of archaeological origin which join to disprove Torrey's thesis, we may cite the word *darkēmônîm*, "drachmas," used by the Chronicler

<sup>11</sup> Cf. *Jour. Bib. Lit.*, XL, 115.

<sup>12</sup> See *Journal of Theological Studies*, XXX (1929), 54 ff., and the writer, *Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible* (1932), p. 221, n. 107.

<sup>13</sup> See J. Kutscher, *Kedem* (Jerusalem), II (1945), 74; cf. already the writer, *Jour. Bib. Lit.*, LXI (1942), 126.

<sup>14</sup> See especially the two most recent studies: R. de Vaux, *Revue Biblique*, 1937, 29-57; and the independent article of Elias J. Bickerman, *Jour. Bib. Lit.*, LXV (1946), 249-275.

<sup>15</sup> See the admirable sketch by Franz Rosenthal, *Die aramaistische Forschung* (1939), pp. 63-71, with bibliography.

several times in his fifth-century narrative.<sup>16</sup> Many scholars insisted that the word was an anachronism and could not have been employed before the Greek period. The only extra-biblical occurrence of the word was the דרכמנא of a Phoenician inscription from the first century B. C. E. However, numismatic finds have proved that the Attic drachma was regularly employed as a medium of exchange in Syria and Palestine from the middle of the fifth century at the latest until the Greek conquest.<sup>17</sup> Virtually all coins found in Palestinian excavations from the Persian period are Attic drachmas or imitations of them. The same is true of coins found by natives in Palestine. Moreover, several of these local drachmas bear an Aramaic inscription reading *Yehūd*, "Judah," from which it follows that by the fourth century the Jews had been granted the right to strike their own coins, like the high priests of Hierapolis in Syria. A more complete disproof of this argument for a late date of the Chronicler could hardly be presented.

If we turn then to preëxilic times, we also find a great many confirmations of the Chronicler in detail, showing that his extra-Deuteronomic sources were, at least in part, historically respectable. A few examples must suffice. In the account of Judah in I Chron. 2-4 numerous details have been archaeologically confirmed and it has been shown that chapters 2 and 4 refer to the late preëxilic age.<sup>18</sup> The reference in 4.23 to the royal potteries has been strikingly confirmed by the analysis of the stamped jar-handles of the period 700-587 B. C. E.<sup>19</sup> The

<sup>16</sup> Since the singular of this word nowhere occurs we are justified in restoring it as \**darkām* or \**darkemāh*; cf. Brockelmann, *Vergleichende Grammatik*, I, 451, and Goetze, *Language*, 1946, 126. In later Hebrew we find a number of plurals ending in *ônîm* added to the singular. Cf. also in the Chronicler's work *bîrânî-yôl*, "fortresses," from the singular *bîrāh* (II Chron. 17.12; 27.4). There was, accordingly, no word \**darkemôn* at all, but only the plural *darkemônîm*.

<sup>17</sup> The writer, *Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible*, pp. 174 f., with references. On these coins see most recently M. Narkiss, (תרצ"ו) *מטבעות היהודים*, pp. 17-23.

<sup>18</sup> For the basic historicity of the material in these chapters see M. Noth, *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins*, 1932, pp. 97-124. Noth's inclination to date it back to the ninth century has somewhat obscured the archaeological background, which is certainly that of the seventh century.

<sup>19</sup> For the latest discussions see Albright, *Annual of the American Schools*

list of descendants of Jehoiachin in 3.17–24 has been confirmed and illustrated by cuneiform and Aramaic documents, not to forget Hebrew seal inscriptions: from the Babylonian archives we learn that the first five sons of Jehoiachin were born before 592, thus pushing back the probable date for each of the subsequent generations; Yigeal (v. 22) may be the Gealyahu (בן המלך = "of royal blood") of a seal impression from Beth-zur,<sup>20</sup> probably belonging to the sixth or the fifth century; the names of the seven sons of Elioenai in v. 24 are well attested from the Elephantine Papyri and the Jewish burials in the necropolis of Alexandria.<sup>21</sup>

If we turn to the Chronicler's insistence on Davidic origin of the guilds of Temple singers, it is no longer possible to maintain the late date of their origin which has been so calmly taken for granted by most biblical scholars. Some of the extensive evidence in favor of a tenth-century origin of these guilds has been already set forth by the writer, who intends to deal with the subject in detail at an early opportunity.<sup>22</sup> It is enough to say here that the names are archaic and Canaanite, not post-exilic and Israelite. *Êtān* is the 'Atyn of Ugarit (fourteenth century) and *Ilēmān* stands for \**Ilmyn*, another name of the same formation (common in Ugaritic names); Chalcol had the same name as Kulkul, a musician of Ascalon in the thirteenth century. The male and female musicians turned over by Hezekiah to Sennacherib as part of his tribute, according to Assyrian sources, were doubtless also temple musicians.

In a convincing study G. Beyer has shown that the list of towns fortified by Rehoboam in II Chron. 11, 5–10 is authentic; at least an equal authenticity must be attributed to the details about wars and building operations in connection with Uzziah,

of *Oriental Research*, XXI/II, 74 f., with references to the earlier literature; C. C. McCown, *Tell en-Naṣbeh*, I, 156–161; cf. also E. Sellin's paper, "Die palästinischen Krughenkel mit den Königsstempel" (*Zeits. Deutsch. Pal.-Ver.*, 1943, pp. 216–232).

<sup>20</sup> *Bull. Am. Sch. Or. Res.*, No. 43, pp. 8 f., and Sellers, *The Citadel of Beth-zur*, p. 59, Fig. 50: 12. נאליהו is an abbreviated form of \*נאליהו (like חוקיה for יחזקיהו and כוניה for יכניהו). A נאל for \*נאליהו is even commoner.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. *Jour. Bib. Lit.*, XL, 111; LVI (1937), 155.

<sup>22</sup> See provisionally *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* (1942), pp. 126–9.



Jotham and Ahaz.<sup>23</sup> Yigael Sukenik has recently pointed out that the siege engines of Uzziah were not for hurling stones or arrows at all, but for protection of slingers and bowmen, thus eliminating a standing charge against the Chronicler.<sup>24</sup> Even more convincing is the remarkably accurate account of the building of the Siloam Tunnel by Hezekiah (II Chron. 32.30). In II Chron. 35.20 there is a statement about Necho's campaign in Syria which is in strict accord with the details of the Nabopolassar Chronicle, (published in 1923), while the wording of II Kings 23.29 is misleading.<sup>25</sup>

A very good illustration of the historical value of the additional matter in Chronicles is found in the survey of Asa's reign, which includes a number of regnal years. The regnal years are so consistent and intelligible in themselves that there is no reason whatever for rejecting them. Even Morgenstern insists correctly on the soundness of the first of these regnal years, according to which Uzziah removed the queen-mother, Maachah, from her position in the fifteenth year of his reign.<sup>26</sup> But the date of the invasion of Baasha in the 36th year of Asa (II Chron. 16.1-6), though supported by references to the 35th, 39th and 41st years, has been universally rejected because it conflicts with the data of Kings, according to which Baasha had been dead for eight years at that time. Recently the writer has given solid grounds for accepting the statement of the Chronicler about the year, and cutting nine or ten years from the reign of Rehoboam to cancel the excess.<sup>27</sup> The accession of Rehoboam would then fall about 922 and that of Solomon about 961. In order not to complicate his argument the writer omitted any reference to the date of Hiram I of Tyre which, according to the Tyrian annals as reported by Menander of Ephesus and Timaeus, two of the most reliable ancient historians, fell 155 years before

<sup>23</sup> Cf. the sketch by Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (1943), pp. 182-4.

<sup>24</sup> *Bull. Jewish Pal. Explor. Soc.*, XIII (1947), pp. 19-24.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Noth, *op. cit.*, p. 182.

<sup>26</sup> *Heb. Union Col. Annual*, XV, 111; cf. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, p. 158, and *Bull. Am. Sch. Or. Res.*, No. 87, pp. 27 f.

<sup>27</sup> *Bull. Am. Sch. Or. Res.*, No. 100, p. 20, n. 14.

the Foundation of Carthage in 814/3, that is in 969/8.<sup>28</sup> If we follow Kings, with all other recent writers on the subject of chronology, we find ourselves in difficulties, since a contemporaneous reign of considerable length for David and Hiram is attested by a number of passages in Samuel and Kings. If we follow Kings the two could not well have reigned contemporaneously more than a few months at most, but if we follow the Chronicler we have a period of at least eight years in common (more if Solomon's reign did not quite reach the traditional forty years).<sup>29</sup> Of course, the Tyrian annals may have been in error, or Josephus may have calculated wrong, so this confirmation is not on a level with the strictly archaeological examples we have given above. However, we have not invented a new date for the Foundation of Carthage (825 B. C. E.) with Kugler,<sup>30</sup> nor have we concocted a brand new Tyrian era with Vogelstein,<sup>31</sup> in order by such *ad hoc* innovations to compel the chronologies to agree.

The foregoing illustrations are by no means exhaustive, since the evidence in favor of the Chronicler has been steadily accumulating during the past quarter century. However, it must not be supposed that the evidence is wholly one-sided. It is more difficult than ever to accept the stories of the wars of Abijah (II Chron. 13), Asa (II Chron. 14),<sup>32</sup> and Jehoshaphat (II Chron. 20) *au pied de la lettre*, since we know that the numbers are exaggerated out of all relation to the possible facts. There can be no doubt that the Chronicler's version of the religious reforms of Asa, Jehoshaphat and Hezekiah is highly colored and presents

<sup>28</sup> For a brief statement of the evidence for accepting this date, preserved by Josephus, as correct, see Eduard Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*, II, 2 (2nd ed.), pp. 125 f.

<sup>29</sup> If we could rely on Josephus' statement that the building of the Temple took place in the twelfth year of Hiram, we should have a strikingly exact confirmation of my chronology (which at this point is the same as that of Julius Lewy). However, the year is probably the result of some calculation made quite secondarily.

<sup>30</sup> *Von Moses bis Paulus* (1922), pp. 172 ff.

<sup>31</sup> *Biblical Chronology*, Part I (1944), pp. 22 ff.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. the writer's reconstruction of the historical nucleus (which makes admirable sense), *Jour. Pal. Or. Soc.*, IV, 146 ff.

a picture of the orthodoxy of these kings which accords with postexilic standards, in striking contrast to the matter-of-fact statements of the Deuteronomist editor of Kings. Yet it is not necessary to attribute fabrication of facts to the Chronicler. Instead we may safely suppose that the latter, when confronted with two or more versions of what happened, selected the version which suited his idea of what must have happened — in other words, he gave preference to data which fitted his own conception of history. This is obviously what happened in II Chron. 8.4, where the Tamar of I Kings 9.18 has been emended to Tadmor in the Syrian Desert. Tamar was a small caravan post southwest of the Dead Sea, and it had long since been forgotten, whereas Tadmor (Palmyra) must have been well known, since it is already mentioned in Assyrian inscriptions of the early eleventh century and was soon to become a famous caravan city. In keeping with this change Hamath-zobah is brought into the narrative, though it was only Zobah, not the neighboring Hamath, which was conquered by David and remained part of Solomon's empire.<sup>33</sup>

At this stage we must clarify our ideas of the literary character and date of the Chronicler. Many scholars have studied the peculiar style and language of our author in those sections which he does not quote from known ancient sources. The best treatments of his diction are those of E. L. Curtis, which limits itself principally to vocabulary and idiom,<sup>34</sup> and Arno Kropat, which deals in great detail with the Chronicler's syntax.<sup>35</sup> Since these two excellent studies are quite independent, they are doubly reliable as guides. C. C. Torrey<sup>36</sup> and Arvid S. Kapelrud<sup>37</sup> have studied the language of the Ezra Memoirs in relation to

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Noth, *op. cit.*, p. 201; contrast Lewy, *Heb. Union Col. Annual*, XVIII (1944), 447 ff., where the problem is complicated by the importation of very questionable etymological hypotheses.

<sup>34</sup> See Curtis and Madsen, *Chronicles (ICC)*, pp. 27–36.

<sup>35</sup> *Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik (Beihefte zur ZAW, XVI, 1909)*.

<sup>36</sup> *The Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah (Beihefte zur ZAW, II, 1896)*.

<sup>37</sup> *The Question of Authorship in the Ezra-Narrative, a Lexical Investigation (Norsk. Videnskaps-Akad., Hist.-Filos. Kl., 1944, No. 1)*.



the Chronicler and find them to be as nearly identical as can well be imagined in the case of sections dealing in part with different matter. From this situation Torrey, followed by Gustav Hölscher, drew the only logical deduction which was possible on his premise that the Chronicler wrote in the third century B. C. E.; he deduced that the Ezra Memoirs were apocryphal and that there may never have been a personage who played the role attributed to him. Kapelrud, on the other hand, is unwilling to go so far as Torrey; he thinks that the Ezra Memoirs originated in "Chronicle circles . . . acquainted perhaps with a very scanty tradition about Ezra . . . The Chronicler is not one single author personality . . . By this designation we must rather understand a whole circle or more probably group of circles that . . . little by little worked out their own view of Israel's history . . . It is these circles that have taken up the Ezra tradition and continued it in their own language."<sup>38</sup>

But is it reasonable to reconstruct such scribal "circles," operating against other circles and having epicircles attached to them, as thought by some recent writers, whose mouthpiece Kapelrud happens to be? In view of the extremely small population of Jerusalem before late Maccabaeon times, when it overflowed the old walls, the number of scholarly scribes can never have been large. In the fifth century B. C. E. the population of all Judaea can scarcely have averaged over fifty thousand. In the writer's opinion the postulation of Deuteronomic and Chronicler "circles" is essentially a vestigial survival of historical romanticism and has no more objective basis in general than the belief in the mysterious emergence of higher thought, including folklore, from the inarticulate masses of the population.<sup>39</sup> It is a pleasure to underline with emphasis the sound reaction of Martin Noth against these conceptions of authorship. In 1943 Noth wrote, in the course of an elaborate analysis of the work of the Chronicler: "Zunächst muss betont werden, dass das Werk in seiner Grundlage auf einen bestimmten Verfasser zurückgeht, dem allein die konventionelle Benennung 'Chronist' . . .

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 96 f.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. my remarks, *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (1940), pp. 81 f., and my more detailed discussion, *Jour. Am. Or. Soc.*, LX, 283 ff.

zukommt."<sup>40</sup> As Noth emphasizes, the individualities of style are so great that the Chronicler's own style cannot possibly be attributed to a circle or circles.

Of course, recognition of the individuality of the Chronicler does not mean that we have here only a single edition of his work. It has been emphasized by virtually all recent writers, including Rothstein-Hänel, von Rad, Welch, Noth,<sup>41</sup> that there are clear traces of two successive redactions. Proving this in detail may, however, be difficult, in view of the complexity of the initial collection of material and the drastic vicissitudes through which the text passed subsequently. It would seem most likely that the second edition was made subsequently to the author's death, and that confusion between the editions had something to do with the extraordinary vicissitudes of transmission, reflected by the wide divergence between the Alexandrian Greek recension (First Esdras and the version of Nehemiah followed by Josephus) and the Hebrew text which we have.

We have already seen above that there is not a single valid argument left for dating the Chronicler in the Greek period. The correct date for the original edition is evidently set by the absence of any reference to Persian kings following Darius II, and the closing of the Davidide genealogy in the seventh generation after Jehoiachin (see above). By dead reckoning on the basis of the average of 23 years to a generation which we find in the pre-exilic monarchy of Judah, we obtain a total of about 161 years (on the principle of the oldest surviving son which is employed in the Davidide genealogy). Deducting this from the latest probable date for the birth of the oldest surviving son of Jehoiachin, now fixed by the Weidner tablets at about 596, we obtain a probable date about 435 for the birth of the eldest son of Elioenai. The latest high priest in the list given in Neh. 12.22 is Jaddua, Johanan's successor, but in v. 23 we learn that the records employed by the Chronicler extended only to the time of Johanan. The latest Persian king (v. 22), contemporary with Johanan (as we know from the Elephantine Papyri) and

<sup>40</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 153.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Noth's discussion, *op. cit.*, pp. 153 ff. For Welch's view see his book, *The Work of the Chronicler* (1939), pp. 149 f.

Jaddua, was Darius II (423–405). The latest representative of the Jewish community was Ezra (v. 26), following Nehemiah and the high priest Joiakim (cir. 490–460). On any assumption of rationality in the Chronicler's compilation, we should have to date the first edition of his work toward the end of the fifth century, between 425 and 405 B. C. E. The reëditing of his work, in which the Memoirs of Nehemiah may have been added, need not be placed after the end of the fifth century or the very beginning of the next. Against this conclusion there is not a single concrete fact which can be adduced; all the pertinent arguments against it are highly subjective.

The writer published his first paper on the subject of Ezra in 1921, when he defended Van Hoonacker's view that the mission of Ezra should be dated in the reign of Artaxerxes II, in 398 instead of 458.<sup>42</sup> Being greatly impressed by Torrey's lucid argumentation in support of his thesis that "there is not a garment in all Ezra's wardrobe that does not fit the Chronicler exactly,"<sup>43</sup> the writer concluded — not that the Chronicler wrote the apocryphal Ezra Memoirs but — that Ezra wrote the Chronicles, in keeping with very ancient Jewish tradition.<sup>44</sup> Since then many other scholars have independently dated the Chronicler about 400 B. C. E.,<sup>45</sup> even earlier than the writer's original date in the first half of the fourth century. Meanwhile the writer has become convinced that the date of Van Hoonacker is too late and that there is no adequate reason to strike out the reference to Nehemiah in connection with Ezra, Neh. 8.9.<sup>46</sup> In

<sup>42</sup> *Jour. Bib. Lit.*, XL, 104–124.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, p. 119.

<sup>44</sup> *Baba Bathra*, 15a.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. the survey given *Jour. Bib. Lit.*, LXI (1942), 125. Noth accepted a date about 400 B. C. E. for the *Grundbestand* of the Chronicler's work in 1940 (*Das Gesetz im Pentateuch*, p. 67 = 115), but in his more recent book often cited above, pp. 192–7, he comes out strongly for a date in the third century. However, he offers only subjective arguments for this lowering of chronology. The fact is that we know so little about the fourth and third centuries that even legitimate speculations about the development of religion and literature in them must not be used as foundations for dating literary works which purport to deal only with the period before the end of the fifth century B. C. E.

<sup>46</sup> For the writer's reconstruction of the history of this period see especially



other words, Ezra followed Nehemiah to Palestine, possibly in the 27th or 37th year of Artaxerxes II.<sup>47</sup> Nehemiah's influence was then responsible for Ezra's coming,<sup>48</sup> which would be otherwise inexplicable unless we wish to accept the bald hypothesis of Eduard Meyer and H. H. Schaefer that orthodox Judaism was the deliberate creation of the imperial Persian authorities. The evidence from personal names and other sources for the succession Nehemiah-Ezra is just as impressive as it has always been, and a few subsisting difficulties vanish if we accept Bertholet's view that Ezra was a younger contemporary of Nehemiah.

If Ezra was the Chronicler, many difficulties disappear. The incorporation of his Memoirs in the first person, but in exactly the style and diction characteristic elsewhere of the Chronicler becomes perfectly intelligible. The peculiar diction in question, which is saturated with Aramaisms, though it remains plastic and shows development in the direction of Mishnaic Hebrew, is perfectly in accord with Ezra's background. Since he came from at least four generations of Babylonian-born Jews, his Hebrew had become thoroughly aramaized. Yet Ezra knew Hebrew; the Hebrew of the Chronicler is a living language. Nehemiah, on the other hand, could probably not write anything but Aramaic; the Hebrew of his Memoirs is a transparent translation from Aramaic, done by a secretary who had an excellent command of the sacred tongue but who translated literally, without having a grammatical understanding of the differences between Hebrew and Aramaic syntax. In order to write his book we may safely suppose that Ezra had the scanty remaining archives and the memories of living men ransacked for materials, which he edited with profound respect for what

his survey of Israelite history in the forthcoming volumes *The Jews and Judaism*, edited by Louis Finkelstein; the last sections have been reprinted in *Biblical Archaeologist*, IX (1946), 2 ff.; cf. pp. 10-25.

<sup>47</sup> This is approximately the view of Bertholet, *Die Bücher Esra und Nehemia* (1902); the writer has followed it — though not without occasional backsliding — for the past twenty years (cf. *Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible*, 1932, pp. 218 f.).

<sup>48</sup> Cf. the interesting observation of Kapelrud, *op. cit.*, pp. 52 f., that Ezra 8.22 shows knowledge of Neh. 2.9. There can be little doubt that Ezra and Nehemiah became bitter foes; cf. *Biblical Archaeologist*, IX, 13 f.

he found in books and traditions, but with scarcely the most elementary conception of critical method. It is, therefore, incumbent on the historian to accept his material with gratitude, but to sift it with care. To reject it out of hand is both subjective and uncritical.

## II. THE JUDICIAL REFORM OF JEHOSEPHAT IN THE LIGHT OF EXTERNAL DATA

Having shown that the Chronicler compiled his work toward the end of the fifth century B. C. E., and that he was careful about his facts wherever we can check them,—though undoubtedly lacking in what we should call critical judgment—we can turn with confidence to the passage II Chron. 19.4-11. We translate it as follows:

"And Jehoshaphat dwelt in Jerusalem; but he repeatedly went out among the people, from Beersheba to Mount Ephraim, converting them to Yahweh, the God of their fathers. (5) And he installed judges in the land, in all the fortified towns of Judah, town by town; (6) and he said to the judges: 'Pay attention to what ye are doing, for ye judge not on behalf of men but of Yahweh, who shall be<sup>49</sup> with you for purposes of judgment. (7) And now let reverence for Yahweh be incumbent upon you; watch what ye do, for in the presence of Yahweh our God there can be no dishonesty nor partiality nor taking bribes.'<sup>50</sup> (8) And in Jerusalem also Jehoshaphat installed some Levites and priests and heads of Israelite families for religious cases<sup>51</sup> and (to decide) controversies involving the inhabitants<sup>52</sup> of Jerusalem. (9) And he gave them the following instructions: 'Thus shall ye do, fearing Yahweh, truthfully and, with complete integrity; and whatever judicial case shall come into your jurisdiction from

<sup>49</sup> Read either <יהי> עמכם or <יהוה> עמכם, the haplography was induced by the preceding יהוה; the bad state of the Chronicler's text is well known.

<sup>50</sup> Note the two successive Aramaic infinitives, which would have been unthinkable in earlier times.

<sup>51</sup> משפט יהוה.

<sup>52</sup> With the versions and Kittel's Bible.

your countrymen living in their towns, whether<sup>53</sup> they are cases of homicide or whether they are (civil cases) involving the judicial interpretation of decrees, ordinances and laws, (do not limit yourselves to legal action, but) warn them in order that they may not incur guilt before Yahweh and (his) wrath come upon you and upon your countrymen — thus shall ye do in order not to incur guilt. (11) So now Amariah the chief priest shall be over you in all religious<sup>54</sup> matters, and Zebadiah son of Ishmael, head of the tribe of Judah, (shall be over you) in all civil<sup>55</sup> matters; and the Levites shall be your official agents.<sup>56</sup> Act vigorously and let Yahweh be with the man who is good.' "

As we have indicated above, this passage bears unmistakable indications of the Chronicler's hand, both in the language and in the religious point of view. But to infer hastily from these facts that the judicial reform of Jehoshaphat is a fiction of the Chronicler is thoroughly unjustifiable after the discussion in the first part of this paper. Wellhausen's idea that the story is an aetiological explanation of the king's name is scarcely possible in such a late period; moreover, the reform of the judiciary may equally well have been suggested to the king or his advisers by his very name itself. That the administration of civil justice was transferred long before the Exile from the "elders"<sup>57</sup> to royally appointed judges may be taken as certain, since there are innumerable historical parallels. We may rest assured that there were in the fifth century B. C. E. some lawyers who were acquainted with the elements of Jewish legal history; it would be very strange if Ezra himself were not among the number. It

<sup>53</sup> For this idiom, relatively common in Phoenician, see the writer's observations, *Bull. Am. Sch. Or. Res.*, No. 83 (1941), pp. 16 (and n. 11) and 19.

<sup>54</sup> יהוה (דבר).

<sup>55</sup> הַבְּלִי (דבר).

<sup>56</sup> The word *šōlér* has very much the same meaning as Sumerian *maškim*, Accadian *rābišu*; cf. Landsberger, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, 38, 276.

<sup>57</sup> The significance of the formal council of elders, or "senate," in Canaanite and Phoenician life is being cleared up rapidly; cf. Wilson, *Jour. Near East. Stud.*, IV, (1945), 245, and note also the *paršamūtu*, "elders" of Tyre, in the treaty between Esarhaddon and Baal, king of Tyre. Note further the elders (*šībūtu*) of 'Irqatu (Arce) in Amarna (Knudtzon ed., No. 100. 4). The elders of an Israelite town were much less important!



is not necessary to suppose that Jehoshaphat was the first Israelite king to reorganize the judicial system (see below). At first, we may suppose, the crown intervened in local affairs to the extent of selecting magistrates from among the "elders"; when this system failed to work satisfactorily, royal judges were sent in. There is nothing in our narrative to indicate that Jehoshaphat went farther in this direction than to designate local dignitaries as royally appointed judges. The true significance of his reform would seem from the text to have consisted in the prominence given the Levites and priests. It has been thought that different courts were set up in Jerusalem to decide religious and civil cases, but the text says nothing of the kind. From it we learn that the judges appointed to serve in the court in Jerusalem included Levites, priests, and prominent laymen, who were to judge both kinds of cases; in religious matters the chief priest acted as "foreman," while in civil cases the titular head of the tribe of Judah<sup>58</sup> took his place. It stands to reason that the civil and religious spheres overlapped in a high proportion of the cases that came up for trial, so the arbitrary separation of the joint court into two bodies would presumably create more confusion than it eliminated. There is no direct statement in the text about the composition of the local courts, but we may safely suppose that they also included priests and Levites as well as members of prominent lay families. It is true that the Chronicler might have frowned on the practice and have deliberately omitted reference to priestly judges in local communities, but it is quite unnecessary to assume this, since his interest was obviously concentrated on the court in Jerusalem to the exclusion of the local courts, which he mentioned because they formed an integral part of the tradition which he was transmitting.

A curious and interesting situation in the Book of Deuteronomy throws valuable light on the evolution of the judiciary

<sup>58</sup> This reference to the old tribal head strongly suggests that the story refers to an early phase of the Monarchy, when the head of the tribe still occupied an important place in society, even though his power — never very great in Israel — had already been weakened.

in Judah. As is well known, many scholars, including the writer, are convinced that the nucleus of Deuteronomy is much older than its redaction toward the end of the seventh century B. C. E. One of the arguments employed by the writer (*Jour. Bib. Lit.* 1936, p. 168; *Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible*, 1932, pp. 154 f.) has been precisely that the civil code preserved in fragmentary form by Deuteronomy antedates the institution of royal judges by Jehoshaphat. In this old civil code there are many references (e. g., 19.12; 21.2 f., 4, 6, 19 f.; 22.15 f., 18; 25.7 ff.) to the judicial function of the elders. These passages are distinctly older than the passages where there is reference to the appointment of שפטים ושטרים (16.18), or to the coöperative judging of "Levitic" priests and (royal) judges (17.8 ff., 19.15 ff.), both as in II Chron. 19. It stands to reason that the coöperation of royal judges and priests on the bench had been functioning long before the seventh century B. C. E. Ezekiel (44.24) took the judicial functioning of priests as a matter of course.<sup>59</sup>

The situation in Deuteronomy, as described in the preceding paragraph, is by no means isolated. All through the books devoted to the Mosaic Age (Exodus-Deuteronomy) we find a similar situation. The preëxilic and exilic editors did their best to eliminate post-Mosaic matter and innovations from the time of the Monarchy. In the religious sphere, for instance, there is no reference to the Temple or to the guilds of singers. In the civil sphere there is no hint of the elaborate development of Israelite society under the Monarchy. On the other hand, the editors of D and P, in particular, were deeply concerned to establish codes normative for their own times and the future. Hence we find the unconscious importation of institutional anachronisms into both collections—an extremely valuable aid to the historian! No treatment of the legal books which

<sup>59</sup> The tradition reflected in I Chron. 23.4 and 26.29 ff., according to which David already employed thousands of Levites as judicial agents and judges (שטרים ושפטים), is naturally anachronistic—quite aside from the Chronicler's preference for exaggerated numbers in his oral or written sources. However, there is no reason to doubt that it faithfully describes an important Levitic function in the latter part of the Monarchy.

does not take this historical polarity into account stands any chance of being successful.

Without indulging in further inferences, in view of the limitations of our knowledge, the writer wishes to call attention to a striking parallel in Egypt, nearly five centuries before the reign of Jehoshaphat. Shortly after his accession Harmais (Haremhab, cir. 1350-1319 B. C. E.) issued a decree for the reformation of the Egyptian judiciary. This decree he had inscribed on a stele in the temple of Amun at Karnak; the excellent translation of Breasted has now been revised and brought up to date by Kurt Pflüger, who has utilized subsequent copies and collations by W. Max Müller and Kurt Sethe.<sup>60</sup> Unfortunately the text of the stele is broken in many places, but there is so much repetition that this situation is not as serious as might appear. After the usual preamble there are ten long sections, each containing a distinct ordinance against extortion. Under the later kings of the Eighteenth Dynasty the corruption of the Egyptian bureaucracy had reached appalling heights, and the situation appears to have grown worse under the weak rule of the Heretic King and his immediate successors. The purpose of the ordinances was both to protect the king against the peculations of corrupt tax-gatherers and soldiers, and to protect the people of the realm against the exactions of the officials. The ordinances are followed by a detailed account of the royal reform of the courts, with which we are specially concerned here.

Harmais begins the account of his reorganization of the judiciary by describing his tour of the entire country in order to learn conditions at first hand (cf. v. 4 in the Chronicler's narrative). He goes on to say (lines 3, left, ff.): "I sought out persons of integrity (*tmm-r3*), good in character (*nfrw b't*), knowing how to judge thought (*rhw wd' 'my-ht*), hearkening to the words of the palace and the ordinances of the court; I appointed them to judge the Two Lands . . . I put them in the large towns of Upper and Lower Egypt, every one with his compensation (*snb hr mtnf*) without exception; I put before them rules (*tp-rdw*)

<sup>60</sup> See *Jour. Near East. Stud.*, V (1946), 260-276. Breasted's translation (*Ancient Records*, III, pp. 22-33), though antiquated in detail, remains useful.



and ordinances (*hṗw*) . . . I guided them to the way of life, leading them to justice; I taught them as follows, 'Do not enter into close relations with other people (*m snsṇ kyw m rmt*), do not accept a gift from another . . . ' " Knowing the sordid story of judicial corruption in Egypt one recognizes the wisdom of insisting on the highest integrity on the part of judges and in giving them regular salary; one suspects, however, that the salaries soon ceased to be paid and that many judges did not even wait for their normal income to stop before accepting bribes and corrupting justice!

After this introduction, the king proceeds to order remission of all taxes paid by members of the *qnbt* courts of Upper and Lower Egypt (6, left). He next decrees that any official (*ḥ3ty*-') or priest (*ḥm-nṯr*) who sits in the *qnbt* court to administer justice but violates justice shall incur the penalty of death. "Behold, my majesty has done this in order to restore (or ameliorate, *smnh*) the ordinances (*hṗw*) of Egypt." Then comes (line 7, left) the most important statement, describing the constitution of the reformed *qnbt* courts: "*ḥm-nṯr* priests of the temples (*r3-prw*), *ḥ3ty*-' officials of the Residency (palace), together with *w'b* priests of the gods, forming every respected *qnbt* court, shall judge the citizens of every town." Omitting further repetitions, we have given the gist of Harmais's account of the reorganization of the Egyptian civil (*qnbt*) courts. Pflüger has cited a sound reason for Harmais' preference for priests in the reconstruction of the judicial system.<sup>61</sup> The Restoration Inscription of Tut'ankhamun, in describing the reorganization of the priesthood after the suppression of the Aten heresy, goes on to say (line 17): "he appointed *w'b* priests and *ḥm-nṯr* priests, sons of the notables (*srw*) of their towns, each son of a well-known man whose name was in repute." After the liquidation of the priests of Amun by Akhenaten and the (probable) liquidation of many more who had joined the Aten movement by the vengeful adherents of Amun, the priesthood was seriously depleted and its ranks had to be filled afresh. Of course, the cleavage between priests and laymen in Egypt was far less than in Israel. It is

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 268.

important to note that Harmais limited the *qnbt* judges to the two foremost classes of the priesthood and to high officials from the Residency of the king, endeavoring to secure a judiciary which was at the same time above bribery and strictly loyal to the king. Whether his effort was successful for more than a very short time we may safely doubt.

That priests continued to be dominant in the composition of the civil courts of the New Kingdom a century later seems to follow from the fact that the panel of a case tried in the year 1256 B. C. E., according to a Berlin papyrus,<sup>62</sup> was composed of nine *w'b* and *hm-ntr* priests, together with the secretary of the court, who was a layman. However, in the late twelfth century, a court convened for the purpose of trying tomb robbers was composed mostly of lay officials, with only two priests.<sup>63</sup> Our evidence is much too sketchy to permit of any generalizing.

It stands to reason that there were many reforms of the courts of Egypt, in which the proportion of priests to laymen may frequently have varied. The significant thing is that priests of two classes formed an important part of the civil judiciary of Egypt for centuries before the time of Jehoshaphat. Moreover, we must bear in mind that recent discoveries and observations have demonstrated the extent of Egyptian influence on the institutions of the Israelite monarchy. A few illustrations must suffice. R. de Vaux<sup>64</sup> and J. Beggich<sup>65</sup> have shown in detail that the chief officials of David and his successors, including the *טופר*, the *מוכיר* and *הבית* *אשר על*, reflected time-honored Egyptian official functionaries, the *sh(sš)*, *whmw* and *šty*, respectively. K. Elliger had previously pointed out the close parallel between the "thirty" associates of David and similar institutions in Egypt.<sup>66</sup> The writer has called attention to a more general

<sup>62</sup> See Erman-Ranke, *Aegypten und aegyptisches Leben im Altertum* (1923), p. 157.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 156. For the general subject of the part taken by priests in the courts of Egypt see H. Kees, *Ägypten (Kulturgeschichte des Alten Orients)*, 1933, pp. 220 f., 256; T. Eric Peet, *Jour. Egypt. Arch.*, X (1924), pp. 118 ff.

<sup>64</sup> *Revue Biblique*, 1939, pp. 394-405.

<sup>65</sup> *Zeits. Alttest. Wiss.*, XVII (Neue Folge, 1940/41), 1-29.

<sup>66</sup> *Palästina-jahrbuch*, XXXI (1935), 64 ff.

parallel between the role of the high priest of Yahweh at Shiloh in the twelfth and eleventh century and that of the high priest of Amun at Thebes in contemporary Egypt.<sup>67</sup> Here he would like to point out another, hitherto unrecognized, parallel between the twenty-four "watches" (משמרות) into which the Jewish priesthood was divided in Persian,<sup>68</sup> Hellenistic and Roman<sup>69</sup> times and the twelve divisions of the associate priests of the Egyptian temples, each of which served a month in rotation and which were called "the hourly watch of the temple" (*wnwt ht-ntr*).<sup>70</sup> The reduction of a month's rotation to a half-month is presumably secondary; it scarcely alters the principle involved. Besides, in Solomon's time the principle of monthly rotation was known and applied in other directions.<sup>71</sup> The organization of the monarchy of Judah also followed Egyptian prototypes closely in the following striking points. The kings of Judah had personal names and throne names, like the kings of Egypt; we know the alternative names in six cases (Jedidiah-Solomon, Abijam-Abijah,<sup>72</sup> Azariah-Uzziah, and the three last kings of Judah).<sup>73</sup> Through the earlier monarchy, down probably to

<sup>67</sup> *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, pp. 107 f.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. my now antiquated discussion of the priestly organization after the Exile and the origin of the *mishmārôt* (*Jour. Pal. Or. Soc.*, 1926), pp. 93-100 (the reading '*Adayah*' has proved wrong and must be replaced by *Yehûd*, as proved by Sukenik). The list of priestly orders in Neh. 10 and the two in Neh. 12 differ slightly, partly owing to the errors and omissions of copyists, but it is pretty clear that twenty-four were intended, just as in I Chron. 24; the variations in names show that the whole system was still fluid, but that it had been instituted anew after the Exile (before the early fifth century, according to Neb. 12.12), presumably in imitation of a preëxilic system.

<sup>69</sup> For the subsequent history of the priestly orders see especially Samuel Klein, *Beiträge zur Geographie und Geschichte Galiläas* (1909) and later studies.

<sup>70</sup> On these priests see particularly H. Kees, *Ägypten*, pp. 246 ff.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. I Kings 4.7; 5.28.

<sup>72</sup> The form אבִיָּם is not a mistake, as commonly supposed, but is a perfectly good archaic hypocoristicon, for \**Abīya-mi*, "My Father Is Truly . . .," exactly like the *Aḥiyami* of a cuneiform letter of the fifteenth century from Taanach (cf. *Bull. Am. Sch. Or. Res.*, No. 94, p. 20, n. 44). The name *Abīyami* appears in a full form in the late twentieth century B. C. E. as 'bym 'mmw, 'Abīyami-'ammu, "The People Is Truly My Father," (Sethe, *Aechtungstexte*, p. 45); for another full form cf. אבִי־עַם (Gen. 10.28).

<sup>73</sup> The writer pointed this out *Jour. Bib. Lit.*, 1932, p. 85, n. 25, and has



the death of Hezekiah,<sup>74</sup> the kings of Judah and Israel reckoned their regnal years from the beginning of the civil year in which the king acceded to the throne; the same practice was normal in Egypt during the Saite period, following a much older practice of the Twelfth Dynasty.<sup>75</sup> While we have no absolute proof that it was in vogue in Egypt during the eleventh and following centuries, it is only reasonable to suppose that it was. It must be emphasized that these are only selected illustrations out of a great many which might be brought, especially if we were to include the domain of material remains as well as of institutional practices. The tremendous influence exerted by Egypt on the civilization of Palestine and Phoenicia is familiar to every archaeologist, no matter to which period he turns. It would, accordingly, be passing strange if there were no observable influence from Egyptian quarters on the administration of justice in Palestine, especially under the monarchy. Of course, we know from the Amarna Tablets and other sources, how familiar the Canaanites were with Egyptian courts in the pre-Israelite period. During the Israelite Monarchy Egyptians in Palestine and Palestinians in Egypt were constantly spreading Egyptian ideas and practices, which were certain to be adopted by the highly intelligent Israelites as soon as they became convinced of their utility.

To conclude our paper, we may say without hesitation that the narrative in II Chron. 19 is a substantially correct account of the judicial reform of Jehoshaphat, though it does not tell the entire story. On the other hand, the account in II Chron. 17.7-9 of the mission of four (!) high officials and ten (!) priests sent by the same king "to teach in the towns of Judah . . . and with them was the book of the law of Yahweh . . . and they taught the people" may well be a misunderstood doublet of the tradition of judicial reform. However, here again our tendency to dogmatic skepticism may be simply a function of our ignorance.

repeated it subsequently. A detailed study by A. M. Honeyman is soon to appear [see now *Jour. Bib. Lit.*, 1948, pp. 13-25].

<sup>74</sup> See *Bull. Am. Sch. Or. Res.*, No. 100, p. 22, n. 29.

<sup>75</sup> See now the detailed treatment by A. H. Gardiner, *Jour. Egypt. Arch.*, XXXI (1945), 16-23.

## MORITZ STEINSCHNEIDER'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO JEWISH HISTORIOGRAPHY

By SALO W. BARON

Steinschneider was not an historian; not even an historian of literature or science, to the history of which he had made such signal contributions. He was primarily a bibliographer who, through a stupendous familiarity with manuscripts and rare books, was able to elucidate an endless array of details, pertaining to a great variety of subjects in the history of Jewish and cognate cultures. Yet he happens to be the author of the *Geschichtsliteratur der Juden* which, published in 1905, is thus far the only comprehensive work covering a large area of Jewish historiography. Although this volume, too, is not really a history of Jewish historians, but rather, a bibliography of Jewish historical sources, Steinschneider's contributions to medieval and early modern Jewish historiography here and elsewhere are so significant that, in many respects, he has no peer in that much-neglected discipline.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. below n. 72. Apart from the usual periodical abbreviations, the following shortened forms will be used in our notes: *AL* = Arabische Literatur der Juden, Frankfurt, 1901; *BIIB* = Bibliographisches Handbuch über die . . . hebräische Sprachkunde, Leipzig, 1859, 2d ed., Jerusalem, 1937; *BM* = Bibliotheca mathematica (Stockholm); *CB* = Catalogus librorum hebraeorum in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, Berlin, 1852-60, new impression, Berlin, 1931; *EJB* = Essays in Jewish Biography by Alexander Marx, Philadelphia, 1947; *FE* = Die fremdsprachlichen Elemente im Neuhebräischen, Prague, 1845; *GL* = Die Geschichtsliteratur der Juden, Frankfurt, 1905; *GS* = Gesammelte Schriften, I, ed. by H. Malter and A. Marx, Berlin, 1925; *HB* = Hebräische Bibliographie, ed. by Steinschneider, Berlin, 1858-65, 1869-81; *HU* = Die hebräischen Uebersetzungen des Mittelalters, Berlin, 1893; *JBGW* = Jahresberichte der Geschichtswissenschaft, I-VI, Berlin, 1880-88 (the page references here are given to the respective first sections of each volume); *JL* = Jewish Literature, English transl., London, 1857; *PAL* = Polemische und apologetische Literatur in arabischer Sprache, Leipzig, 1877; *St.* = Steinschneider.

Moreover, for more than a quarter of a century (1858-65, 1869-85) with a brief three-year interruption, he served as editor of the *Hebräische Bibliographie* or as author of the annual review of the literature pertaining to post-biblical Jewish history for the *Jahresberichte der Geschichtswissenschaft*. He also wrote a great many book reviews, particularly in the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* (1881-96). In all these capacities he critically appraised most of the current Jewish historical publications. In fact, he considered himself a sort of watchdog for their reliability and worthwhileness. "We shall not let ourselves," he declared, "be confounded in our belief that faithful gardeners must first of all carefully weed their gardens and that he who plucks nettles must be prepared for stings."<sup>2</sup>

Never discouraged by the proven futility of his warnings, he went on pointing out the shoddiness of many pretentious works of scholarship and, less frequently, placing his stamp of approval on worthwhile studies. By the very nature of this type of work, his own contributions have become extremely diffuse, as may be noted by a mere glance at Kohut's bibliography of his writings and the subsequent supplements in *ZHB*. Nor can one expect real consistency in numberless casual remarks uttered over a period of nearly seven decades. If two of Steinschneider's most faithful and best informed disciples found themselves discouraged after years of labor by the complexity of mastering his widely scattered publications and his never-ending corrections and comments on his previous notes,<sup>3</sup> we must necessarily limit our-

The present writer wishes to thank Professor Alexander Marx for generously placing at his disposal transcripts of many manuscript letters received by St. Brief excerpts from these letters in their original spelling (elsewhere modern orthography is preferred) are given below in notes 6, 18, 21, 35, 36, 47, 54, 55, 56, 60, 86. The letters from Cassel and Loeb were collated with the originals. Unfortunately those written by Geiger were not available at the time this essay went to press. It is to be hoped that Prof. Marx will find it possible to publish a comprehensive selection from St.'s valuable correspondence. Cf. also below n. 23.

<sup>2</sup> *HB*, III, 65.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. George Alexander Kohut's "Bibliography" in *Festschrift . . . Steinschneider*, Leipzig, 1896, pp. v-xxxix, successively brought up to date in *ZHB*, V (1901), 189-91; IX (1905), 90-92; XIII (1909), 94-95; and H. Malter and



selves in the present essay to a few more or less summary observations. It is hoped that serious students of Steinschneider's works will go beyond the quest of further documentation and additional illustration — the present writer himself has suppressed many data which appeared to him of secondary importance — and pursue independent explorations in the numerous ramifications of this significant phase in the work of the great polyhistor.

### 1. GENERAL APPROACHES

Steinschneider's interpretation of history was in many ways superior to that of his contemporaries. More sharply than others he drew the distinction between "history" in the political sphere and, what he called, the history of culture and that of literature. In fact, in one of his periodic attacks on Graetz, he raised objections to the fifth volume of the latter's *Geschichte* as being devoted too much to literature and too little to history proper. Similarly, when Kayserling's *Sephardim* dedicated to biographical and literary studies of Spanish Jewry was followed by the first volume of his *Geschichte der Juden in Spanien und Portugal*, Steinschneider nodded approval with respect to this extension of his friend's interest into the domain of history as such.<sup>4</sup>

To be sure, he clearly realized the complementary nature of the two disciplines as illustrated, for example, in the evolution of Hebrew printing. He also admitted that Jewish political history in the Dispersion had many peculiar features. It "substitutes," he declared, "sufferings for deeds, martyrs for heroes, narrow communal needs and petty personalities for lofty state

A. Marx's Foreword to their ed. of *GS*, pp. viii f. St. himself often lost track of his publications. Not only are his articles and letters filled with complaints about misplaced manuscripts, inability to consult previous comments, etc., but he, as well as the editors of *ZHB*, overlooked the fact that one of his "Miscellen" had already appeared in that journal three years before. The mistake was detected by Marx after the event. Cf. *ZHB*, VI, 159; IX, 120 f.; X, 92.

<sup>4</sup> *HB*, III, 67. In a previous instalment he had actually blamed Kayserling for having superimposed upon his earlier strictly literary and bibliographical study an "Aufguss" of history, in order to make it more palatable to the general reader, *ibid.*, II, 83 f. Cf. also III, 104; IV, 11, 64 f., etc.

interests. However, the status and treatment of Jews mirrors the entire culture of states and peoples, for whose history they have transmitted testimony of a contemporary, often unique character."<sup>5</sup> By thus narrowing the concept of political history, he came close to justifying Graetz's well-known rationalization of the prevailing excessive emphasis upon "the history of scholars and sufferings." Yet, by underscoring this weakness in other writers, he counteracted to some extent the widespread desire to obscure this fundamental issue.

Like no other Jewish scholar of his day, Steinschneider also stressed the importance of comprehensive knowledge of the non-Jewish environment and background. In contrast to the prevailing "isolationist" treatment of Jewish history he tirelessly emphasized that "Jewish science and literature can properly be understood and evaluated only in their interrelations with non-Jewish sciences and literatures." Even in medieval Christendom, he contended, despite the concerted efforts of state and church, segregation never was water-tight. This was evidenced not only by the constant use of languages other than Hebrew by the Jews, their "linguistically amphibian life," but also by the impact of Maimonidean philosophy on Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas, the unexpectedly large number of Hebrew translations from the Latin and the extensive personal relations between Christian and Jewish intellectuals. "The spirit knows no ghetto!" Most intimate were, however, the interrelations in areas where a modicum of freedom existed and particularly in the two world literatures, the Arabic and the German.

Among Arabs and Germans Judaism was "integrated" [aufgegangen] but not destroyed. With its own specific approaches it recognized the unity of mankind's great and universal ideas and, thereby, broke through the walls of isolation . . . . Judaism's position within these literatures is one of the noblest tasks of our historiography, equally significant for the evolution of Jewish and world letters.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>5</sup> *JBGW*, I, 38; *HB*, II, 108; V, 110.

<sup>6</sup> *FE*, pp. 5 f., 26, 29; *BHB*, p. x; *HU*, p. xxii; *HB*, II, 83; VI, 31 f.; IX, 12 f. St.'s remark (*ibid.*, I, 110) concerning the personal relations seems to have inspired Berliner's pertinent monograph. Cf. also the sharp expression

So conceived, the understanding of the Jewish past required arduous study of the various disciplines and countries. Not sweeping generalizations, but an endless series of monographs was indicated. This was, in his opinion, the keynote of all of Zunz's writings directed at the "redemption of the science of Judaism from the ghetto."<sup>7</sup> Steinschneider himself, evidently under the impact of his early studies in Vienna and Leipzig, particularly under the renowned Leipzig Arabist, Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer whom he greatly admired, devoted his primary attention to the Jewish role in Arabian culture. Already in 1845 he spoke of the Arab expansion of the seventh century as a great turning point in Jewish as well as general history. At that time he undertook to compile a general survey of Arabic Jewish letters under the title of *Bibliotheca Judaeo-Arabica*. After numerous detailed contributions over a period of six decades he, finally, carried out his intention in his "Introduction to the Arabic Literature of the Jews" (*JQR*, 1897-1901) and his *Arabische Literatur der Juden* (1901). If, as early as 1846, Frankel cautioned him against his excessive "Arabomania," Steinschneider retorted sixteen years later that he was still confident of finding in Maimonides certain elements of the Kuran and Al-Ghazzali much rather than of Plutarch.<sup>8</sup>

of similar views in his "Robert von Anjou und die jüdische Literatur," *Vierteljahrsschrift für Kultur . . . der Renaissance*, I (1885), 137. They had long been shared by his friend, David Cassel. "Das Judenthum tritt mit allen Wissenschaften," Cassel wrote him on April 13, 1843, in connection with their joint preparations of a comprehensive Jewish encyclopedia, "mit allen Völkern, mit allen Gegenden, in eine bald nähere, bald weitere Berührung, und sobald man aus dem eigentlichen Gebiete jüdischer Wissenschaft herausgetreten ist, wird man durch die unbegrenzte Ausdehnung dessen, was weiter zu durchwandern ist, erschreckt, z. B., jüdische Geschichte."

<sup>7</sup> *HB*, VI, 7, 31. From this angle he sharply criticized a number of studies, published in 1883 and devoted to the general characterization of Judaism or the Jewish people, particularly in relation to Christianity, "welche, wenn sie unbefangen und gerecht sein soll, der Gesamtgeschichte, namentlich der Kulturgeschichte, entnommen sein müsste. Die letztere ist kaum angebahnt. Auf diesem Boden, oder richtiger in diesem Luftreiche, lassen sich Schlösser aus gewissen allgemeinen Voraussetzungen bauen; da ist viel Spielraum für geistreiche Kombination, aber auch für kühne Behauptungen." *JBGW*, VI, 38.

<sup>8</sup> *FE*, pp. 26 f.; *AL*, pp. xii ff.; xlvii ff.; Z. Frankel, "Allgemeine theologische



Curiously, this great student of medieval Judaism, of its institutions, leadership and intellectual achievements, had very little use for the medieval period as such, "which the Jews outgrew, much later than the Christians." Like that entire post-Napoleonic generation of Jewish scholars, he was greatly affected by the romantically inspired historical schools of Germany. But like Zunz, Geiger and the others he nevertheless revealed the indestructible impact of European enlightenment in his outlook on life and, particularly, in his political and intellectual liberalism. He glorified, for instance, the impact of modern chemistry on breaking down the walls of separation between the classes and thereby destroying the medieval corporate divisions "with all their moral shortcomings." Few eighteenth-century historians found sharper words of condemnation for the Christian Middle Ages than he did in contrasting them with the evolution under Islam.

What are the most outstanding features in the totality of the two cultures? [he inquired]. Here segregation in political, economic and social life, extortion, expulsion and Inquisition, incitement, persecution, arson and pillage, false accusations of poisoning of wells and ritual murder. On the Jewish side intimate family life, trust in other-worldly rewards and national restoration, combined with rigid adherence to tradition — religious persecution, like an anvil, steels resistance to the point of martyrdom —, a plethora of intellectual acumen, wasted on casuistic and hermeneutic minutiae, the Siamese twins of belief and superstition, the eye always turning from the valley of tears toward Heaven.

What pained him most was that his beloved country of adoption, Germany, had been the major culprit. Explaining his failure to include in the *Hebräische Uebersetzungen* many translations by medieval German Jews, he wrote: "The German Middle Ages offered the Jews torture, stakes for men and books, double toll

Bibliographie," *Zeitschrift für die rel. Interessen*, III (1846), 466 (with reference to St.'s introduction and notes to Maimonides' *Sefer ha-Yihud*); *HB*, V, 117 f. In 1845 he also planned to state briefly his views in a comprehensive article, "Araber," in the projected Jewish encyclopedia, *FE*, *l.c.*

for emperor and feudal lords at the turnpike and cemetery, remission of penalties and premiums for the desertion of the paternal faith and law, superstition for all happenings in life, also pity and compassion with individuals — all these matters on a par with the southern countries — but no science or enlightenment.”<sup>9</sup>

As a liberal and a Jew, Steinschneider was ready to fight for the ideals of the Revolution of 1848. He doubly resented Germany's slow progression toward Jewish equality, as he felt that modern Jewry had immeasurably enriched German culture and, through Hebrew translations, helped spread it to other lands. Upon publication, in 1862, of a German translation of Macaulay's well-known address which “with a truly classical precision and brevity disposes of the so-called Jewish emancipation problem,” he wondered whether one ought to regret more the delay of thirty years in its appearance or the fact that it was still needed. Notwithstanding his general contempt for publicist efforts, he greatly admired Gabriel Riesser's consistent championship of Jewish equality, while he resented the debates at the Prussian Diet of 1860 with their purely utilitarian approach to the Jewish question, rather than the simple adherence to the principle of human equality. He believed that there was but one remedy for religious persecution, i. e. free science and humanitarianism. For this reason he published with full approval Geiger's exhortation to his coreligionists that, while the struggle for emancipation “is legitimate and must be carried through to success, the confidence in ultimate victory finds its full support only in the reliance on one's innermost spirit, in the conviction that Judaism is a spiritual power whose full influence on the historic evolution of mankind must not be curtailed.” Deeply convinced that the fate of Judaism and that of humanity were deeply interlocked, he uttered the truly prophetic warning, “The history of the daughter religions is a constant series of attempts to murder

<sup>9</sup> *Der Aberglaube*, Hamburg, 1900, p. 5 (=Sammlung gemeinverständlicher Vorträge, XLVI, 347); *AL*, pp. vii f.; *HU*, p. xx; *GL*, pp. 26 ff. Cf. also *HB*, XVIII, 81: “Obwohl die Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland im Allgemeinen nur Variationen desselben traurigen Themas darbietet . . .”

their own mother. Should one ever succeed, the guilty will share the fate of their victim."<sup>10</sup>

His ardent championship of Jewish emancipation did not make him an anti-nationalist, however. He realized the extraordinary peculiarities of the Jewish national feeling and national history "which confronts the historian with a wholly unparalleled problem" and accepted Zunz's definition of the Jews being "a nation *in partibus*." While emphasizing that Jewish history in the Dispersion should be treated only by countries and regions and that it could be understood only in terms of its environment, he was also convinced that these often disparate strains must be brought into a single focus of the people's own evolution.

The Jews are a nation in the original meaning of that word. Other nations have emerged from racial units into peoplehood by virtue of their fatherland and language and the ensuing common interest and easy exchange of ideas. The Jews, on their part, have been united, at least thus far, by an ideal fatherland and Scripture reaching back into their remotest antiquity as well as the liturgical and scholarly languages associated with it. They have neither sufficient reason for denying their race nor for being ashamed of their

<sup>10</sup> *HB*, II, 73 f.; III, 48 f.; IV, 26 f.; V, 139; *HU*, p. xxiv. On his views on the interrelations between the science of Judaism, the Reform movement and Jewish Emancipation cf. *HB*, IX, 76 ff. It is also noteworthy that William Wright, though generally corresponding with him only about technical problems of scholarship, felt prompted to add to the letter of May 18, 1857 a reassuring postscript: "I think your coreligionists have a fair chance of being admitted into parliament this time, as government has taken up the measure." Cf. A. Marx, "William Wright's Letters to Moritz Steinschneider," *Gaster Anniversary Volume*, London, 1936, p. 436. St.'s innermost belief in the ultimate triumph of justice through learning found expression even in his concluding remarks on the Passover Haggadah in L. Landshuth's *מניח מראשית*, Berlin, 1856, p. xxix: "In der Tat hat die Bosheit stets ihren besten Helfers-helfer an der *Unwissenheit* gefunden! Möge daher das Gebot: 'Du sollst verkünden deinem Sohne' nie vergessen sein in Israel, und den Abend des Erlösungsfests das Licht der Wissenschaft verklären." On his (minor) part in the Revolution of 1848, cf. Marx, *EJB*, p. 131; and Adolph Kober, "Jews in the Revolution of 1848 in Germany," *JSS*, X (1948), 157, 163 f. In 1880, however, while criticizing Henry S. Morais's biographical sketch, St. contended, at least with reference to his Vienna period, that he had "an keinerlei politischer Agitation sich beteiligt," *HB*, XX, 59. Cf. also below notes 67-70.



intimate ideal unity . . . We affirm, in fact, that the concept "Jewish" cannot be understood merely in terms of dogmas and rituals, but that the entire Jewish cultural evolution must be viewed as a mirror of the underlying religious and moral ideas and national convictions.

This strongly idealistic, almost Hegelian, interpretation did not blind him to dangers to Jewish survival inherent in Jewish emancipation and assimilation. "Perhaps the true flow of Jewish history," he once opined with a shrug, "will dry up with the complete indenization of the Jewish citizens." But such future possibilities must not affect the treatment of the past of which, for example, born Jews, even if converted to another faith, were part and parcel.<sup>11</sup>

At the same time he gradually lost his youthful interest in the Zionist solution. In the early 1840's he had belonged to a group organized in Vienna by Abraham Benisch to promote "the liberation of our Jewish fellow-countrymen from the galling yoke of intolerance and oppression."<sup>12</sup> In the following two years

<sup>11</sup> *JBGW*, I, 38; *HB*, II, 81; *AL*, p. xlix. In the programmatic statement introducing his bibliographical journal he likewise declared: "Wir scheuen es nicht für das Schrifttum der Juden in seinem Zusammenhang die Bezeichnung 'national' zu gebrauchen . . . Die Befürchtung religiöser, politischer und sozialer Folgerungen und Trugschlüsse aus dieser Bezeichnung kann für unser Blatt von gar keiner oder höchst untergeordneter Bedeutung sein, indem wir den Kampf und Sieg auf dem dankbaren Felde religiöser und politischer Kontroverse den hierzu berufenen — und unberufenen — Federn überlassen." *HB*, I, 2. Cf. also the early comment on Ibn Sahula in his *Manna*, Berlin, 1847, p. 113; his *Letteratura italiana degli Giudei*, Rome, 1884, pp. 2 f.; "Die Mathematik bei den Juden," *BM*, 1893, 66; "Allgemeine Einleitung in die jüdische Literatur des Mittelalters," *JQR*, XV (1903), 303 f.; and Marx, *EJB*, p. 181. He sounded a noteworthy warning, however, against the prevailing fashion of treating the Spanish Marranos indiscriminately as a part of Jewish history (*HB*, III, 68; VII, 98); and, finally, entirely repudiated the term, race "mit seinen verworrenen, entweder verherrlichenden oder erniedrigenden Nebenbedeutungen" (*GL*, p. vi). Cf. also his critical review of "Racenstudien" in *HB*, XIII, 18 ff., 44; *JQR*, XVII, 577 f.; and below notes 60 and 65.

<sup>12</sup> From later reminiscences by Albert Löwy, one of the charter members of that secret society, in the *Jewish Chronicle* of Nov. 13, 1891, p. 30. Cf. also S. W. Baron, "Abraham Benisch's Project for Jewish Colonization in Palestine (1842)," *Jewish Studies* . . . *George A. Kohut*, New York, 1935, pp. 73 ff.

he often summarized for the *Orient* reports from his friends in England about the progress of Benisch's negotiations with the Foreign Office and the general reaction of the British public to the Jewish aspects of the Eastern Question. In one particularly noteworthy correspondence he took issue with the religious impulses of the British movement for Jewish restoration and declared with his characteristic vigor,

For those, however, who, like ourselves, allow more room to secular rather than to divine elements in their speculations concerning the future fate of Syria, it does not appear to be one of the most improbable suppositions that the restoration and nationalization of the Jewish people, though unlikely at present, should ultimately become the means of reconciling the conflict of interests [Prätentionen] and of establishing a new focus of civilization in that interesting region.

He merely doubted the immediate efficacy of a Jewish petition to the Great Powers.<sup>13</sup>

Later on, however, he became ever more skeptical. Increasingly averse to "sentimentality," he had absolutely no understanding for the emotional outpourings of a Judah Alkalai or Moses Hess. He seconded his associate, Kayserling's condemnation of Hess's *Rom und Jerusalem* because of its *Prinzipienreiterei* in calling for the return to the ancient synagogue and, on his own, voiced the hope "that this book will not be used *against* prudent endeavors to ameliorate the sad conditions of the Jews in Palestine." He condemned even more sharply Pinsker's *Autoemancipation* and similar ideas voiced in the *Ha-Maggid*. "This type of propaganda for the colonization of Palestine," he declared, "is more dangerous than antisemitism and it is high time that we protest against all such endeavors." With reference to Herzl's political Zionism, finally, he wrote in a private letter (Nov. 24, 1898), "Already in 1840 I was convinced that our ideas emanating from Austrian conditions were unrealizable. Since that time Zionism appears to me to be a fit subject for

<sup>13</sup> *Orient* of Sept. 19, 1940, pp. 290 f. On St.'s authorship of this anonymous correspondence, cf. Baron, *op. cit.*, p. 75 n. 9.

folk psychiatry such as can only be cured slowly by continuous education. For a Messiah mankind requires perhaps the whole span of its life on our globe."<sup>14</sup>

Nor were his religious moorings any too deep. Although in his youth a serious candidate for rabbinic office and often serving as a preacher, he gradually drifted away from all organized religion. He continued to praise Judaism's historic ideals. He explained, for example, East-European Jewry's preference for translations from Schiller rather than Goethe by the former's enthusiasm for freedom, justice and virtue. His alleged "Arabomania" did not prevent him from contrasting the serious-mindedness of medieval Hebrew poetry with the prevalence, among the Arabs, of satirical and amorous poems. He also believed that unlike Islam's and Christendom's quest for secular power, "Judaism had the higher task of teaching the power of an oppressed faith." At the same time he contended "that in our civilized world one can no longer draw any line of demarcation between the various faiths on the basis of general moral concepts and that, within each religion, a constant struggle is carried on between belief, superstition and disbelief, barbarity and humanity." For this reason he objected, in particular, to the idea of Jewish "mission," propagated by Geiger and other reformers. He finally came to the conclusion that "religion is not science in the narrower sense, but rather an opposing principle; the latter is characterized by absence of preconceptions, the former by authority; the latter by law of nature, the former by miracles." He amplified this rare profession of faith by stating,

The Haggadah tells us that God created many worlds and destroyed them; Arabian theologians teach us that God's creation is a continuous process; history shows that man never ceases to create his God in his own image. God's peace, the messianic prophecy concerning the beating of

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 85; Marx, *EJB*, p. 132; *HB*, I, 28; V, 137; XXI, 123. In another context he referred with more detachment, to the renewed interest of many Jews in the colonization of Palestine created in the early 1880's "by the Russian calamities." *JBGW*, IV, 28. Cf. also his cool obituaries of Alkalai, Elijah Gutmacher, Hirsch Kalischer and even Benisch himself in *HB*, XV, 133; XVIII, 135.



the swords into plowshares (Micah 4:3), will not come true until man stops his haggling about God and for God.<sup>15</sup>

Under these circumstances he could view with considerable detachment the heated religious controversies of the day. His attempted "impartiality" often reflected merely his indifference, indeed impatience with people who were ready to shed copious ink, if not blood, in a struggle over theological minutiae or communal control. While he deeply appreciated the historic significance of Talmudic Judaism, he had little use for the militant Orthodoxy of his time. He was fair enough to appreciate the validity of certain arguments advanced by the Orthodox against the dangers of modern enlightenment, but he sharply condemned Ignatz Deutsch, the unscrupulous wealthy leader of the Orthodox party in Vienna. "The freedom of movement," he commented acidly, "has flooded the big cities with a wealthy mob, while the old intelligentsia has remained indifferent." He dismissed curtly certain particularly extremist pamphlets attributed to the Hungarian Rabbi Hillel of Szikszó as a "true offshoot of insanity."<sup>16</sup>

Even from the historical point of view he had little appreciation for both Halakhah and Kabbalah, the two mainstays of medieval Jewry's intellectual creativity. As a conscientious bibliographer

<sup>15</sup> *HB*, II, 74; VII, 125 f.; *Manna*, pp. 29, 97; *HU*, p. xxii; *AL*, p. ix. Harping on his perennial theme of the interrelations between Jewish culture and those of the environment he declared, in another context, that the so-called peculiarity of the Jews is often but the outgrowth of ignorance of these foreign influences. "Die Grundideen des Judentums, Einheit und Geistigkeit des Weltprinzips, gleiches Recht und Nächstenliebe, haben vieles Fremde zugelassen, grösstenteils assimiliert, sogar Giftiges, zur Verwirrung seiner unaufhörlichen Leichenredner," *HU*, pp. xxiii f. Cf. also his critique of L. Lazarus's essay on talmudic ethics in *HB*, XVII, 31. It is small wonder that Felix Adler's ethical culture movement struck a responsive chord in St. In his review of Adler's *Creed and Deed* (1877) he stated that the latter's "Religion des Ideals," though devoid of mass appeal, should find general approval among the educated members of all denominations, *HB*, XVIII, 10. Cf. also G. A. Kohut, "Steinschneideriana," *Studies in Bibliography . . . Solomon Freidus*, New York, 1929, p. 84.

<sup>16</sup> *HB*, VII, 6, 74; VIII, 4. He readily admitted his unfamiliarity with the writings of a leading Orthodox rabbi, Seligmann Beer Bamberger of Würzburg, *ibid.*, XVII, 89. Cf. also *ibid.*, I, 32; III, 28, etc.

he duly registered works written in these fields, especially by such great masters as Saadiah, Maimonides or Nahmanides. He even published special bibliographical studies of kabbalistic writings. But he could not conceal his general indifference to the Halakhah and his outright hostility for all mystic movements. At times he spoke openly of the "mind-splitting" Halakhah and the "degenerated study of the Talmud" in his day. He denied that there was any need or possibility of an exact translation of the Talmud into a western language. All forms of mysticism, on the other hand, were to him but variations of superstitious beliefs, largely borrowed by Judaism from the surrounding civilizations. Their very secrecy was but a scheme for maintaining control over the masses akin to the methods of "secret diplomacy" in the political sphere. Shabbetai Zevi was, of course, nothing but "an infamous sectarian and renegade." As to "curative Hasidism," itself "a malady of Judaism," he admitted on more than one occasion that he was unfamiliar with its literature, an admission doubly significant in the case of this born bibliographer endowed with insatiable curiosity for the smallest leaflet written in Hebrew on any subject. Most fundamentally he considered historical studies consistent with the theory of evolution, because of its essential optimism, but not with any genuine belief in tradition which is necessarily pessimistic and must look forward to some messianic irruption in order to put an end to the tragedy of existence.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>17</sup> *JBGW*, VI, 27 f., 41 f.; *Der Aberglaube*, pp. 23, 29, 32; *HB*, X, 156 ff.; XIV, 332 ff.; XVII, 36 ff.; XVIII, 18 ff., 62; *BM*, 1893, 66; *JQR*, XV, 312 f.; *ZHB*, VIII, 154; *GL*, pp. vii, 52. Apart from its irrationality, the Kabbalah was found objectionable also because "Schwärmer, Betrüger und Buchstaben-deuter wussten Alles unterzubringen, selbst Trinität und die Verspottung des Talmuds, hauptsächlich aber bildeten sie einen *Dualismus* aus, in welchem die Völker die 'andere (dämonische) Seite' (כַּפְרָא אַחֲרָא) vertraten." *PAL*, p. 360. Cf. also *MGWJ*, XL, 132 (where he attacked the "Wortschwall" of the compiler of the *Zohar* and declared, "Die eklektischen Lorianer habe ich gar nicht berücksichtigt"); *HB*, X, 156, 161; and other writings listed by G. Scholem in his *Bibliographia Kabbalistica*, Leipzig, 1927, pp. 148 ff. He was close to thirty when, as he wrote with relish, he had thrown off "the drudgery of the irksome, large literature of practical and ceremonial law," Marx, *EJB*, pp. 127 f. Later on he criticized even David Hoffmann's monograph on the

At the same time, he was anything but an adherent of Reform Judaism. He greatly admired Abraham Geiger, "one of the most learned theologians," to whom he devoted a full-length appreciative obituary. He also spoke highly of Gotthold Salomon whom he considered "a model preacher, whose printed and unprinted sermons deserve a complete edition both on account of their importance for the history of culture and because they are to be recommended even today as a corrective for the manifold aberrations of Jewish homiletics." On the other hand, he often spoke deprecatingly of Holdheim's intellectual somersaults and could not refrain even from inserting into the obituary notice a sarcastic remark concerning the Berlin preacher's "alleged" age. He also mentioned without regret the "complete breakdown of the Reform synod." We recall his sharp criticisms of the two basic ideas of the Reform movement, viz., that of a peculiar Jewish "ethical monotheism" and Judaism's "mission" to propagate that faith. More generally he counselled "that all who treat of Reform problems should submit objective arguments in support of their opinions, consistent or modified, of whatever orientation, without blending with them heterogeneous material and present current history with the same scrupulous accuracy which they require in the treatment of ancient times." Such remarks betray his utter lack of understanding for the emotional intensity of these struggles.<sup>18</sup>

first Mishnah as having been written "with much expert knowledge but with an Orthodox tendency," *JBGW*, V, 40. Cf. also *ibid.*, IV, 28. Nor could he repress his anger when he learned from Joseph Halévy's journey that, as in the days of Maimonides, "in Jemen spukt noch der Messiasschwindel," *HB*, XIII, 4 f. On one occasion he objected to a liturgical work "of harmless piety" because it contained prayers of superstitious origin of which most of the worshipers were completely unaware. "Um so mehr müssen wir den Wunsch aussprechen, dass fromme aber denkende, und als Gelehrte in allgemeiner Achtung stehende Männer nicht ihren Namen an die Spitze solcher Unternehmungen stellen," *HB*, II, 24.

<sup>18</sup> *GS*, I, 634 ff.; *HB*, III, 73; V, 38, 59, 138; VI, 17; VII, 123 ff.; VIII, 36, 39 f.; XIV, 134. Cf. also his non-committal reference to David Einhorn's death (*HB*, XXI, 124); and his sarcastic remark (*ibid.*, I, 75) on the *Minhag America* of Wise and Lilienthal (he never forgave the latter for the sloppy list of the Munich Hebrew manuscripts; cf. *ibid.*, V, 107 ff.), which he knew only



It is small wonder that he was taken aback by publications like Israel Hildesheimer's "Open Letter" to Leopold Löw, in which the inadequacy of a "scientific approach" was contrasted with the basic truths of tradition. He did not know how to treat Hildesheimer's exclamation, "Woe unto those who consider intelligence the ultimate aim of religion; woe unto those whose ideal consists in cool objectivity on the basis of history." The complex personality of "the unparalleled" Michael Sachs likewise baffled him completely. In his obituary of Sachs he commented, with an almost audible sigh,

With his thorough classical education and his personal genius for beauty, strict scientific form or discipline was for him rather a criterion of lack of genius. Insofar as it related to theological subjects, it also was a criterion of lack of conviction, if not altogether of character. For this reason he never clearly defined his orientation, nor worked in its behalf as direct teacher . . . Sachs was ingenious [geistreich] to excess and paid due homage only to men of similar capacity and orientation — characteristics truly dangerous to a teacher and historian.<sup>19</sup>

Steinschneider himself often lost his scientific composure, however, in discussing Christian conversionist efforts among Jews. Highlighted in his day by the international repercussions

from newspaper reports. On the other hand, he hailed the acquisition of a large Hebrew library by Temple Emanuel in New York (*ibid.*, XI, 89 f.) and praised highly the rare "clarity" with which Isak Mieses discussed the differences between Orthodoxy and Reform in a Hebrew essay published in Kobak's *Jeschurun*, III (*ibid.*, III, 5). He also welcomed the Prussian law of 1876, allowing secession on grounds of "religious scruples." His position on this controversial subject simply was that "Freiheit gebührt allen; wer sie nicht gebührend anwendet, wird ohne Zweifel den Schaden zuerst an sich selbst gewahren," *HB*, XVII, 6. Cf. S. W. Baron, "Freedom and Constraint in the Jewish Community," *Essays* . . . Linda R. Miller, New York, 1938, pp. 9-22. This lackadaisical attitude appealed, of course, but little to Geiger's ardent temperament. In his letter of Dec. 11, 1853 the latter reproached St. for his lukewarm attitude toward various essays in Schorr's *Hechalus*, II: "Die tüchtigen, zu reformatorischen Resultaten führenden kritischen Untersuchungen über den Talmud und die Rezension über Rapoport's ערך פלין sind Ihnen zu reformatorisch, zu wenig voraussetzungslos, das heisst zu wenig mit der Absicht unternommen, alles zu lassen, wie es ist."

<sup>19</sup> *HB*, I, 97; VII, 9 f.; XIII, 66.

of the Mortara Affair, the ceaseless agitation of the Berlin and London missionary societies, Geiger's pamphlet, *Ueber den Austritt*, etc., this aspect of Judeo-Christian relations appeared to him of focal contemporary as well as historic importance. In his general appreciation of the Muslim rather than the Christian Middle Ages he pointed out that, despite the fairly extensive literature of Judeo-Muslim polemics (to which he devoted a comprehensive monograph), the Muslims entertained close social contacts with Jews, but made few efforts at converting them ("man verkehrte viel und bekehrte wenig"). In the Christian world, on the other hand, the history of enforced and voluntary baptisms was so rich and complex that a comprehensive study — in his opinion, a major desideratum — would require detailed familiarity with a vast literature of eighteen centuries. As a Jew and liberal he rejoiced over the failure of the Berlin mission, whose contributions to the knowledge of the Jewish past he considered negligible. At the same time he resented exaggerations of Jewish apologists (e. g., Rev. David Marks of London) concerning Judaism's traditional forbearance of opposing religious convictions. "The Jews," he declared, "could and can not reasonably respect such religious convictions in the name of which many godless and inhuman acts have been committed."<sup>20</sup>

Steinschneider was little appreciative of the existing leadership of the Jewish community, both lay and ecclesiastical. He held in high esteem such rabbis as Isak Noah Mannheimer and commented on G. Wolf's biography of that distinguished preacher, "Men of Mannheimer's occupation may be divided into three groups: 1) such as pursue principally their own interests under the guise of the common weal; 2) such as identify

<sup>20</sup> *HB*, I, 30, 121; II, 2, 33, 53 f., 80 f., 121; V, 139; *AL*, p. xxi; *JBGW*, II, 52. Of course, he did not mean to deny altogether Islam's conversionist pressures. He himself pointed out that among the more than 200 ascertainable names of Jewish authors of Arabic works were 8 converts to Islam, *AL*, pp. xxi f. He was right, however, about the comparatively greater toleration of the Jewish minority in Muslim lands. He was also greatly impressed by the freedom of religious debates there on which he assembled extensive data in *PAL* which, in his opinion, had merely demonstrated the ineffectiveness of religious polemics (p. ix).

the two; 3) such as subordinate their own to the general interests. Mannheimer, in whose proximity the writer had lived in the years 1836-39, never belonged to the first, not seldom to the last group." But on the whole he felt that ever since the rabbinate had in the Middle Ages deteriorated into a salaried communal office and, hence, begun to concentrate exclusively on "ritualistic practice and unbridled homiletics," it had become a fit object of choice irony and superior condescension by philosophically trained writers. In modern times the "rabbinic bureaucracy" had become too much engrossed in communal politics and the quest for power. It is not astonishing, therefore, that "nowadays men of comprehensive liberal education but reluctantly assume the many-sided yoke of rabbinism." The latter's excessive preoccupation with theological problems also prevents the members of that calling from furnishing unbiased trained workers for the science of Judaism which, as he untiringly emphasized, must be first and foremost *streng wissenschaftlich*. Lay leadership, on the other hand, which found almost inexhaustible funds for all sorts of communal undertakings, had little to spare for searching scholarly investigations — a familiar theme song among Jewish scholars for the last century.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>21</sup> *HB*, I, 52 ff.; VI, 140; VII, 55; *HU*, p. xxiii. Cf. also his sharp attack on M. Duschak's *Umriss des biblisch-talmudischen Synagogenrechts*: "Die Bibel kennt keine Synagoge. Der Verfasser macht sich nach katholischem Muster von Kirche und Kirchenrecht ein Synagogenrecht zurecht, um den Rabbinern Vorrechte der Geistlichkeit zu vindizieren," *JQR*, XV, 311. Knowing his dislike of the rabbinate, Geiger once facetiously wrote him (May 24, 1859): "Uebersehen Sie mir die Niederträchtigkeit, dass ich Rabbiner bin; wenn ich einst zum zweiten Male geboren bin, werde ich es nicht wieder thun." Five years later (April 8, 1864) the great reformer commented in a more serious vein about the "desolate" conditions in Berlin: "Was wollen Sie also von den armen Rabbinern, wenn die Gemeinden und unabhängigen Gelehrten nichts taugen, wenn die ehrlichen und kenntnisreichen Rabbiner naserümpfend betrachtet werden, weil sie das Verbrechen begehen, Rabbiner zu sein?" If, on the other hand, St. objected to Jellinek's appeal (in *Beth-Talmud*, III, 99) for funds for a critical edition of Midrashim, because a just appreciation of Jewish literature would prove more helpful to the Jewish people than the support of Jewish refugees from Russia and their transfer to America, it was not because he disagreed with Jellinek's evaluation of the two endeavors, but



For these reasons he, like Geiger, Zunz, Ludwig Philippson and others, advocated the establishment of Jewish chairs or faculties at general universities, rather than of separate Jewish theological seminaries. Time and again he reverted to that idea, often deploring the fact that Germany had done even less than other countries in securing independent seats for Jewish learning. In a semi-programmatic statement on contemporary Jewish historiography he explained some of its weaknesses by the fact that "the history of the Jews finds no natural point of contact in general schools of learning, has no independent representatives at universities and is encouraged by no prize contests at academies." For himself, he was happy not to be associated with any denominational seminary. Referring to the first publication of the *Wissenschaftliche Blätter aus der Veitel-Heine-Ephraimschen Lehranstalt*, at which institution he had been lecturing for many years, he described the vicissitudes of that foundation since its establishment in 1774 as a center for the promotion of the study of the Talmud. In the subsequent period the founder's family had so deeply become estranged from Judaism that the foundation's income was at times used, with governmental permission, for stipends of students of Christian theology. In Steinschneider's time, however, the institution was "dedicated to the science of Judaism without regard to practical tendencies. For this reason it is even freer than a Jewish faculty attached to a university. It is attended by students of all faiths and orientations and extends the advantages of education and a growing library, free of charge and without strings attached."<sup>22</sup>

"Practical tendencies" of any kind were to Steinschneider the

because he wished to see Jewish scholarship divorced from all practical considerations, *JBGW*, V, 40. In fact, on another occasion he praised Leon Horowitz for the Hebrew pamphlet, *רוסיה ואמריקה* because the latter "will nicht Amerika mit Müssiggängern bevölkern," *HB*, XIV, 8 f. Cf. also *HB*, I, 32; II, 7 f., 82 n. 2; VII, 25 f.

<sup>22</sup> *JBGW*, I, 40; *HB*, V, 119 ff.; VI, 15 f.; VII, 61. St. registered with approval such bequests as Isaac Lyon Goldsmith's legacy of £2000 for a Hebrew chair at the University of London and the establishment of an unbiased "Zunz-Stiftung" for the promotion of Jewish learning, *HB*, I, 26; II, 71; VII, 73 f. He also hailed Alexander II's gift of a diamond ring to Adam Ber Lebensohn as a sign of governmental recognition of Jewish scholarly

bane of Jewish studies. "History," he declared, "even literary history, is the more just and truthful, the less it is forced to reflect present and future conditions, the less its purpose to give instruction is beclouded by the wish to reform." Devoted as he was to the promotion of Jewish learning, he was deeply averse to spreading it among the masses of the population by any form of propaganda and popularization. Personally, he was always prepared to aid young men desirous of engaging in a thorough-going study of any phase of Judaism. Pathetically the then almost nonagenarian Nestor of Jewish studies asked the editors of the *Zeitschrift für hebräische Bibliographie* to publish his request, "If I fail to reply to inquiries from candidates for the doctorate and others concerning manuscripts or dissertation topics, I ask them to assume that I am not in a position to reply." But the number of those to whom he did reply was legion. His correspondence, preserved in the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, embraces letters addressed to him by more than a thousand persons. Unfortunately few of his own letters are preserved, but we have the testimony of Joseph Jacobs and others about the enormous amount of learning which went into some of his postcards.<sup>23</sup>

endeavors and welcomed the sponsorship, by the Imperial Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg, of a Jewish fund for Academy prizes in the field of Hebrew literature, *HB*, I, 65; II, 97. The repercussions of his attack on the newly-founded Berlin *Hochschule*, "the new ghetto for Jewish learning" (1875) and his refusal to accept a call to the Budapest Seminary (1876) are described by Marx in *EJB*, pp. 140, 144. Cf. also idem in "Steinschneideriana, II," *Jewish Studies . . . Kohut*, pp. 318 ff. On his part, St. somewhat naively refused to accept the excuse of a student of the Eisenstadt rabbinical academy that the latter's visit to the Berlin Institute would have been bitterly resented by Hildesheimer, *HB*, XIV, 118. Cf. also *ibid.*, IX, 78.

<sup>23</sup> *Letteratura italiana*, p. 1; *ZHB*, VII, 160; Marx, *EJB*, p. 168. His readiness to help serious-minded scholars came to the fore not only in his opening the pages of his journal to legitimate inquiries addressed to any informed reader, but also in his public offer to place his vast accumulated material at the disposal of any scholar (preferably one having access to Italian libraries) who might wish to compile a comprehensive bibliography of Italian-Jewish literature in the *Corriere israelitico*. Cf. *HB*, VI, 2; IX, 25; XI, 142. Only after several years of waiting he proceeded to the publication of these data in *Il Buonaroti* (1871-76), *Vessillo israelitico* (1877-80) and *MGWJ* (1898-1900).

Somewhat inconsistently he favored publications designed to spread culture among the "backward" East-European Jews. He praised the Galician writer, Isaac Erter not as a poet and stylist, but because "he strove to exercise a moral influence on the culture of his backward compatriots." Even the Hebrew translations of Eugene Sue's *Mystères de Paris* was considered by him "unnatural" only because it revealed to its readers the corruption of the overcivilized metropolis and thus counteracted the beneficial influence of enlightened efforts. But for Germany he condemned all attempts at popularization. He resented the program of such an organization as the Institute for the Promotion of Israelitic Literature which, under the leadership of Philippson and Jost, tried to propogate Jewish learning by publishing books of a semipopular character. He saw in its program an unhealthy acceleration of the progress of Jewish studies which must ultimately lead not only to the lowering of standards of scholarship, but also to the elimination of whatever residue of reverence for learning still existed among the Jewish populace. He was even averse to the prevailing trend of utilizing Jewish history as a major subject of instruction in Jewish religious schools. While wishing to discuss merely a lecture on Jewish physicians, he went out of his way to assail not only the growing practice of public lectures for laymen but also the fact that

since approximately half a century the real instruction about Judaism and its adherents, particularly in previous ages, has found centers of cultivation outside the synagogue under

Conversely, he acknowledged without stint help received from such scholars as Zedner, Neubauer, Lasinio and particularly Prince Boncompagni, "ce noble et libéral savant, qui m'a fourni pendant vingt-cinq années tant des matériaux intéressants." Cf. "Une dédicace d'Abraham de Balmes au Cardinal Dom. Grimani," *REJ*, V (1883), 113. On the other hand, disappointed by the failure of his announcement (in *HB*, I, 5) to elicit sufficient response from contemporary authors, he decided to terminate one of his major bibliographical compilations with the beginning of the century, for "eine Literatur der Gegenwart ist nirgends ohne lebendige Mitwirkung oder ein eigenes Organ ausführbar." Cf. *BHB*, p. xxxi. Unfortunately George Kohut's announcement, nearly two decades ago, of a forthcoming publication of the St. letters by Miss Adeline Goldberg, St.'s devoted secretary, has not yet materialized. Cf. *Studies . . . Freidus*, pp. 86, 118 n. 97.



the firm name of "history." Youth is to learn, in religious schools, to appreciate justly its ancestors, to admire the martyrs, to revere the scholars . . . . The concepts of religion and nation in their old indissoluble combination underly this instruction, in addition to apologetics against anti-semitism which lurk in the background. We find here in the elementary instruction not only an analogy to "church history," which in Christian schools is reserved for higher grades, but early youth is being burdened here with a segment of the history of scholars, for the understanding and appreciation of which it has not the slightest preparation.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>24</sup> *HB*, I, 29, 79 f.; III, 103; *ZHB*, VIII, 151. He also expressed doubts as to the effects of the study of modern Bible criticism and natural sciences upon the religious convictions of Jewish youth, *HB*, XIV, 75. Cf. also *ibid.*, XIX, 4 f. He did not try to repress his gloating over the downfall of the Institute after twenty years of activity which, he believed, had fully justified his reiterated pun of its having promoted Jewish "Makulatur" (waste paper) rather than "Literatur," *ibid.*, p. 132. He evidently forgot that a quarter century earlier he himself had published selected translations from medieval Hebrew writers which, he had hoped, would "das Interesse eines grösseren Publikums für diese Literatur gewinnen." Cf. *Manna*, Preface. In his middle years and ever after, however, he came to believe that "je mehr auf allen Seiten auf eine s. g. praktische Verwendung aller Studien hingedrängt wird, desto dringlicher ist die Mahnung, die Geschichte nicht zur Magd herabzuwürdigen," *HB*, II, 107. Cf. also his *Ueber Sprachkenntnis und Sprachkunde*, Hamburg, 1899, p. 8 (=Sammlung gemeinverst. Vorträge, N. F. XIV, Heft 322, p. 312), which, though itself the transcript of popular lectures, began with an attack on popularization. He underwent a similar transformation with respect to the usefulness of a Jewish encyclopedia. In his late twenties he spent endless hours in preparing, jointly with David Cassel, a draft of a *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, exchanging numerous letters, discussing articles with prospective contributors, etc. In 1865, however, he declared, "Der vor 20 Jahren gefasste Plan einer Realencyclopädie über die gesamte Wissenschaft des Judentums wäre noch heute verfrüht." Later on he sneered at the dilettantism of the American *Jewish Encyclopedia*, ed. by Isidore Singer, calling it the *Singer-Maschine* and but grudgingly admitted some of its merits. Cf. Marx, *EJB*, p. 125; *HB*, VIII, 134; Kohut in *Studies . . . Freidus*, pp. 108 ff. He also rejoiced when he had occasion for a dig at the "practical Englishmen" or for pointing out, on the example of the allegedly pragmatic science of astrology that "der s. g. 'praktische Sinn' — welchen man oft den leeren fruchtlosen Spekulationen gegenüberstellt — sich bis zum Wahnsinn verirrt, wenn er eben nicht von einer vernünftiger Theorie geleitet wird." Cf. *HB*, I, 26; *Der Aberglaube*, p. 7.

Understandably, he heartily disliked contemporary Jewish journalism. His attacks were not so much aimed at the mendacity of the press and abuse of its powers — arguments then frequently heard from such radicals as Ferdinand Lassalle — as at the relative insignificance and ephemerality of its contents. Personally he devoted little time to reading newspapers and magazines. Once he excused himself for declining an offer of a free copy of a periodical. He made no effort to secure issues of even such prominent a journal as the *Archives israélites*. Referring to the history of the Jews in England he readily confessed that “the Jewish journals in London which very likely contain some data [in this field] are not accessible to the reviewer.” The *Jewish Chronicle* certainly did not endear itself to him when, on one occasion, it contended that no copy of the Ferrara edition of the Spanish Bible existed in either of the two major British libraries “without even looking up” his *Bodleian Catalogue*. In any case, he deeply deplored the dispersal of Jewish historical materials in periodicals, jubilee volumes, etc., pointing out that a list compiled in 1878 revealed the existence of some fifty specific Jewish journals, for the most part weeklies, each of which from time to time carried items of genuine historical interest.<sup>25</sup>

He had a special axe to grind in regard to Hebrew periodicals. While he admitted their limited educational value in uncivilized countries (*Länder der Unkultur*), he did not consider Hebrew as an aim in itself, but as a mere instrumentality of ritualistic and scholarly efforts. On learning that Russian Jewry had launched two new Hebrew and one Russian periodicals (the *Ha-Karmel*,

<sup>25</sup> *HB*, III, 12, 36, 76; V, 95; XVIII, 25, 77; *JBGW*, I, 41; IV, 23; VI, 50. Cf. also his comments on the *Jahrbuch für Israeliten* 5619 (in *HB*, II, 22 f.); and on the *Illustrierte Monatshefte* (*ibid.*, VIII, 131); and his caustic remark, “Eine Uebersicht der sich in unerfreulicher Weise mehrenden Zeitschriften giebt Ch. D. Lippes *Bibliographisches Lexikon*” (*JBGW*, III, 57). On the other hand, he irately attacked the liberal *Grenzboten* for reproducing, without proper condemnation, the contents of an early Jesuit treatise referring to the affair of the Jewish boy, Simle Abeles in Prague of 1693. Cf. *HB*, I, 121; II, 80 f. (here St. unnecessarily censured M. Güdemann’s failure to quote him in “Jesuiten und Judenkinde,” *MGWJ*, VIII, 1859, 365–74).

*Ila-Meliş* and *Rassviet*) he inquired as to "how much space they intended to assign to the ever-expanding patriotic reports on condescending acts of toleration, petty personalities and local developments or on ritualistic and religious controversies, how much to outbreaks of unskilled poetry and rhetoric, amateurish accumulation of notes, etc., and how much space and care they intended to lavish on the correct reproduction of strictly scholarly studies, so that each may cling to his own flag?" Defending himself against moderately phrased, but the more effective criticisms of a defender of the existing Hebrew press in Vienna, he exclaimed, "The science of Judaism with its limited resources and personnel can progress but very, very slowly. It is aided least by those who wish to rush up to the pinnacle by lowering its height." For himself, he announced at the completion of the third year of his *Hebräische Bibliographie*, that the journal had reached the optimum of its expansion and that it looked for neither more collaborators nor subscribers.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>26</sup> "Hebräische Zeitschriften," *Zeitschrift für die rel. Interessen*, III (1846), 28-33; *HB*, I, 3, 28, 78, 91; III, 21 f., 101 f.; VIII, 130 (with reference to Keller's *Bikkurim*, II, 194). For a time he himself toyed with the idea of editing a Hebrew periodical. In 1859 he wrote, "Unser eigenes Projekt einer hebräischen Zeitschrift schreitet nur sehr langsam vorwärts, worüber wir durchaus nicht klagen, da wir noch nicht einmal einen Prospectus veröffentlicht, und schon manche Anmeldung erhalten haben," *HB*, II, 2. He was doubtless stimulated to this undertaking by his cherished conviction that, as a result of eighteenth-century German humanism and Mendelssohn's "immortal achievement," German Jewry, even more than the Jewish Hellenists and Arabists before it, faced the historic task, "auf die Gesamtheit ihrer Glaubensgenossen umgestaltend einzuwirken, die jüdische Wissenschaft unter den Juden, wie der Deutsche die Wissenschaft überhaupt, zu vertreten." Nor was he unaware of the necessity of keeping up with the constantly growing output of Jewish monographs and articles for "nirgends gilt das *dies diem docet* mehr als in dem regen Leben der jungen jüdischen Wissenschaft." Cf. *FE*, pp. vi, 29. Nevertheless, this constant look-out for current publications often became so tedious that he decided to discontinue temporarily the *HB* in 1865 and to abandon altogether his annual review of historical literature in *JBGW* after six years. Cf. *HB*, VIII, 129; *JBGW*, VI, 35. After a while he ceased paying attention even to such a valuable scholarly journal as Löwenstein's *Blätter für jüdische Geschichte und Literatur*, published for many years as a supplement to the *Israelit* in Mayence. Cf. *GL*, p. xi.



## 2. CRITICAL STANDARDS

This attitude colored all of Steinschneider's remarks on recent scholarly investigations. In the program of his bibliographical journal he announced his intention of making the review section more descriptive than critical, for "no one devoid of a frivolous approach to criticism would expect from us searching reviews of recent publications in so vast a field." But, pointing out the strengths and, more frequently, the weaknesses of contemporary scholars had already become a passionate habit with him at the age of forty-one when he started the journal. He held too strong convictions on the nature and quality of Jewish scholarship to impose upon himself verbal restraints in voicing them on all suitable and unsuitable occasions. He was not completely blind to the value of studies undertaken by dilettants out of the sheer "zest for learning rooted in Judaism." But wherever he scented the slightest ulterior motives, he went after the culprit with the sharpest weapons in his well-accounted armory.<sup>27</sup>

He was particularly impatient with any incompetent piece of text editing. "We are long accustomed," he complained, "to find in the 'editor' of a Hebrew manuscript the first best unqualified printer, beggar, speculator and the like." In analytical studies, too, he was a firm believer in the precise inductive method and suspicious of all generalizations. Convinced that "one must gather from all corners the stones needed for the construction of Jewish history," he commented, for instance, on Kayserling's *Geschichte*, "The way from the specific to the general of itself leads to a more objective presentation." Of course, where such generalization, as in the case of Ernest Renan, ran counter his own point of view he was doubly aroused. He objected, especially, to Renan's characterization of the Semitic peoples and wholeheartedly approved of H. Steinthal's outspoken reply. "The more Renan's brilliant dialectical and stylistic talent

<sup>27</sup> *HB*, I, 2, 94 f. This was, in part, also the reason for his objections to the excessive stimulation of Jewish studies by popularizing agencies of the community: "Die Wissenschaft will auf einem natürlichen Boden gepflegt sein, in Treibhäusern und Mistbeeten bringt sie nur exotische Gewächse aber keine Früchte," *ibid.*, p. 26.

carries the readers away," he declared, "the more necessary is it to reveal the consequences, or rather the inconsistencies of his antisemitic prejudices." He praised, in particular, Steinthal's "solid moral tone which is far more appropriate to scientific earnestness than scintillating phrases."<sup>28</sup>

Clearly, he could evince little sympathy for such efforts at historic synthesis as were brilliantly represented in his day by the work of Heinrich Graetz. As many other writers before and after him, he complained of the "overhastiness of Jewish historiography" and felt that the time had not yet come for the comprehensive treatment of the entire evolution of the Jewish people by an individual scholar. "He who, like Graetz, has false illusions about it, becomes ever less historical, and hence less honest." With genuine satisfaction he commented on the publications of 1881, "Little has been written, thank God, in the field of general Jewish history. For brilliant aperçus [like James Darmesteter's *Coup d'oeil sur l'histoire du peuple juif*] we shall have no firm foundation for a long time to come."<sup>29</sup>

Not that he resented most the unavoidable individual mistakes in these broad presentations. He realized, of course, that detailed corrections and additions can be made in regard to specialized monographs as much as to comprehensive works of synthesis. In fact, he spent a substantial portion of his life in ever correcting statements in his earlier writings. His comment on Clemens Huart's *History of Arabic Literature*, published in 1903 in a series of *Short Histories* intended for popular use, is typical of his general point of view. He criticized certain mistakes, even "boners," but added, "It would be unjust to evaluate or to condemn on this score the entire work. The reply to the question: For whom do such writings appear? is: for the bookseller. Who

<sup>28</sup> *HB*, I, 95; III, 16; IV, 11; VII, 58 f.; XIII, 18 f., 44; *JBGW*, VI, 38. He encouraged G. Wolf's archival studies: "Möge er auf diesem richtigen Wege vom Einzelnen zum Ganzen verharren," *HB*, VII, 108.

<sup>29</sup> *HB*, II, 66; III, 104; XVI, 36; *JBGW*, IV, 25. He also cited, with full approval, Harry Bresselau's remark, likewise aimed at Graetz, "Es ist ein Unglück der jüdischen Historiographie, dass sie sich der Universalgeschichte zugewandt hat, ehe in Spezialdarstellungen der Boden geebnet und der Pfad gebahnt war," *ibid.*, I, 40.

buys them? This would depend on general considerations for which we have no space here."<sup>30</sup>

He was often inconsistent, however. When asked by the Ersch and Gruber encyclopedia to write a general article on the history of Jewish literature, he knew that both Zunz and Lebrecht had declined the invitation, and yet — we dare say, fortunately — he had enough "temerity" to undertake this comprehensive summary. His essay, grown into seven times its allotted size<sup>31</sup> and later translated into English and Hebrew, became a classic in its field. Although less of a real history than a long array of notes thereon, it was obviously subject to endless corrections. Soon after its compilation Steinschneider himself toiled for a dozen years over his great *Bodleian Catalogue*, which gave him the opportunity of revising many of his earlier assertions. But he was deeply chagrined when some one else, e. g. Jost, censured a large number of these detailed errors. To the good fortune of Jewish scholarship, however, his pique over this and similar experiences did not deter him from publishing later several other broad compositions.

What is more, on frequent occasions, he cited approvingly Selig (later, Paulus) Cassel's article, "Juden" prepared for the same encyclopedia, after he himself had declined to write it. Cassel's fine summary of Jewish history has, indeed, merited the universal acclaim it received in the nineteenth century, but Steinschneider's praise of it as "one of the best works in the field of Jewish history by compass, content and interpretation" shows that he was not really opposed to all legitimate generalizations. He was not even seriously disturbed by Cassel's later conversion from Neo-Orthodoxy to Christianity. Despite his opposition to Christian missionary activities, he treated such genuine converts with comparative complacency. In fact, he did not even dismiss Cassel's short essay on *Die Juden in der Weltgeschichte* as one of those "brilliant aperçus," but expected it to be an "adumbration of future penetrating studies."<sup>32</sup>

<sup>30</sup> ZHB, IX, 153 f.

<sup>31</sup> Marx, EJB, pp. 148 f.

<sup>32</sup> JBGW, I, 46; II, 56 n. 1; IV, 33 n. 1; HB, XIX, 77 n. 1. St. objected here to the studied attempt of Jewish scholars to ignore Cassel's publications on account of the author's conversion. Cf. also *Letteratura italiana*, pp. 11 ff.; "Mathematik bei den Juden," BM, 1893, 67.



Similarly, the Russian-Jewish convert, Daniel Chwolson was treated with considerable friendliness. Steinschneider, who usually reacted violently to criticisms, went out of his way to compliment the compiler of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Hebraicarum*. He who had spent many years in collecting data on medieval Jewish manuscripts — which he later utilized in his *Vorlesungen über die Kunde der hebräischen Handschriften* — admitted here that Chwolson's chapters dealing with the difficult problems of epigraphy and the square Hebrew script have "practically exhausted the existing materials." More, even in the controversy among Chwolson, Harkavy and Strack over the "fanatical forger," Abraham Firkovich, he emphasized that "his personal relations with all these protagonists are almost equally friendly and hence he feels safeguarded against the suspicion of having taken sides unduly."<sup>33</sup>

At times he took sharp issue with Christian scholars, too. We shall see that he rejected, in particular, many of the regnant theories concerning the ancient Semites and biblical criticism. Only occasionally he admitted, as he did in one of his attacks on Ewald, that he wrote "as a Jew." Similarly, in his extraordinarily warm necrology of Alexander von Humboldt, who had "died not to one, but to all science," he pointed out that a very interesting volume could be written about Humboldt's attitude to the Jews.<sup>34</sup>

On the other hand, he censured Paul de Lagarde (who attended some of his lectures), not because of the latter's numerous anti-semitic essays, but chiefly because, in editing Al-Harizi, Lagarde

<sup>33</sup> *JBGW*, I, 43; V, 36; *HB*, XX, 70. Cf. also his praise of Chwolson's *Die semitischen Völker* in *HB*, III, 44; his comments on the backwardness of Hebrew palaeography, *ibid.*, XXI, 95; and his frequent references to Firkovich and his forgeries, *ibid.*, VII, 109 ff.; X, 139; XIV, 133 f. (F.'s obituary).

<sup>34</sup> *HB*, II, 5 f., 37 ff. He quoted, in this connection, from Humboldt's letter to M. Mortara of Nov. 12, 1853 and from another autograph letter to an unnamed correspondent (Steinschneider himself?) of May 4, 1857. To justify the inclusion of Humboldt's obituary in a journal devoted to Jewish bibliography St. argued significantly that it belonged to the annals of that discipline, "welche zum Probirstein echter Wissenschaft überhaupt geworden, — die des Judentums, die noch immer, mit den Juden selbst, auf ihre Befreiung von den Fesseln harrt, an welchen Geistlichkeit und Theologie seit Jahrhunderten geschmiedet."

had "failed to acquaint himself sufficiently with the necessary textual aids and available literature." When he found a Christian apologist for Judaism, like M. J. Schleiden, discussing the role of medieval Jews in the revival of sciences or the "romanticism" of their martyrdom with more zest than knowledge, he lost his temper. "An objective treatment," he declared, "would have served the defended cause much better and would have been more appropriate for a layman." Under these circumstances, he felt, "the martyrdom of the science and history of Judaism will last very long yet, for it finds its torturers among the Jews themselves and their ill-advised friends." He also bitterly complained of the disrespect shown to Jewish studies by those distinguished Christian savants who indiscriminately provided with letters of recommendation such alleged Jewish scholars as were "for the most part men devoid of general education, ignoramuses, charlatans, itinerant beggars and the like."<sup>35</sup>

The only Jewish scholar whom he unreservedly admired was Leopold Zunz. Although never technically Zunz's disciple, he always looked upon the older man as his master. In dedicating his early book, *Die fremdsprachlichen Elemente im Neuhebräischen* (1845) to Zunz (and Fleischer) as "a slight token of deeply felt reverence and gratitude," he emphasized, "Through your classical writings, written and oral communications, you have pointed out to me, too, the road to the 'science of Judaism' and have guided and supported my few attempts so far in this field." Unsparing with superlatives in describing Zunz's works, he compared a chapter in Zunz's *Zur Geschichte und Literatur* with its "extremely ingenious construction" to that of Schiller's *Glocke*. He called Zunz's *Ritus* to the particular attention of those who "know Zunz

<sup>35</sup> Marx, *EJB*, p. 141; *GL*, p. 27 n. 2; *JBGW*, I, 44; VI, 47; *HB*, I, 32; XVII, 34 f. Cf. also his attack on an exaggerating American philosemite in "Die Juden und die profanen Wissenschaften," *MWJ*, XX (1893), 229 ff. I. Loeb shared his deprecation of Schleiden's work. Before sending St. a copy of the French transl. published by the Alliance (cf. *HB*, XVII, 85), he wrote confidentially, "Le travail original fourmille de fautes, mais il est fait à bonne intention, il peut avoir quelque effet utile et à ce titre, il a paru bon de la repandre. Nous avons naturellement laissé à l'auteur toute la responsabilité de ses erreurs. Il y en a tant qu'il était impossible de les corriger" (Aug. 17, 1877).



merely as a scholar and not as a critic." His summary here of Zunz's general attitude in many respects is the best description of his own scholarly ideals.

Zunz possesses [he declared] that piety and sacrificial attitude to research which is indispensable to strict scientific investigation. He combines with it steadfastness in his convictions which resists all temptations of supposed popularity and the bowing before regnant systems. The motto under his picture is, "Thought is powerful enough without pretension and injustice to prove victorious over pretension and injustice." Such approaches are particularly necessary for Jewish literature, especially in the field of tradition and its derivatives in the Franco-German school. There the task is to detect the organism of history in a large, apparently inorganic and blurred mass. There one must pursue unflinching a middle course of prudent criticism between the saga and legend, pious self-deception and pietistic obfuscation, between exaggeration and rejection.

For this reason his works always were epoch-making, basic, comprehensive, although the great mob here, as elsewhere, knows how to praise only those happy ones who march on the broad highway and pluck flowers on the paths where Zunz had blasted rocks, weeded out thistles and strewn seeds. For this entire generation belongs to Zunz's grateful — or ungrateful — pupils.

Before long he came to the conclusion that "praise of Zunz's writings would be an insult to our readers."<sup>36</sup>

<sup>36</sup> *JBGW*, I, 39 n. 4; *HB*, II, 27, 49; XV, 9. Cf. also his admiring review of Zunz's *Zur Geschichte in Serapeum*, VII (1846), 38–45; his list of *Die Schriften des Dr. L. Zunz des Begründers der jüdischen Wissenschaft*, Berlin, 1857 (with numerous attacks on Zunz's detractors); the dedicatory Forewords to his ed. of the *Mischnat ha-Middot*, Berlin, 1864; his *Vite di matematici arabi*, Rome 1874; and such occasional diatribes as *HB* I, 66 n. 1 ("eine kurze, aber in der bekannten Weise des Meisters gründlich gearbeitete Darstellung"); and VIII, 138 ("wie selten vereinigt sich solche Wärme der Begeisterung mit solcher Schärfe der Kritik und solchem Umfang der Gelehrsamkeit"). He must have been terribly shocked when he read in Geiger's letter to him of July 27, 1864 the following devastating comment, which, incidentally, implied also a condemnation of some of his own best efforts: "Mit Zunz habe ich mich recht gefreut, er war ganz der Alte, und ärgerte mich nur, was aber nicht von heute datirt, dass er seine Kraft den deutsch-französischen . . . zuwendet; ich meine, es sei nachgerade im Kote genug herumgewühlt. Ich für meine Person danke Gott, dass ich höhere Probleme gefunden, und denke, dass zu deren Aufhellung



Steinschneider showed considerably less attachment to the other great scholars of that "Sturm und Drang" generation in Jewish scholarship. He spoke feelingly of Rapoport's seventieth birthday, advocated an inexpensive edition of the Prague rabbi's collected works and later devoted to him a fairly long, sympathetic obituary, as he also did for Lebrecht and Zedner. When Luzzatto began editing Yehudah Halevi's *Diwan*, Steinschneider emphasized that the great medieval poet had "the rare luck in Hebrew literature of having found a most qualified editor" and hoped that the projected Bible translation would not divert Luzzatto's attention from the continuation of this work. While he sometimes gave vent to critical remarks on Luzzatto's theological views and once even resented the publication in a Hebrew journal of the Italian scholar's youthful "dreams," he was nevertheless deeply moved when the latter passed away. The news had affected him so profoundly, he declared, "that we cannot bring ourselves to say here a few words about the achievements of this remarkable man."<sup>37</sup>

Abraham Geiger likewise stood very high in his esteem. Despite their basic disagreements on Reform Judaism and totally different temperaments, Steinschneider appreciated the wide range and brilliance of Geiger's researches. Even when he criticized the "tendenciousness" of one or another study and objected, for example, to Geiger's obsession with the "Zadokites," he emphasized that "the objective scholar will resent only —

noch genug zu thun sei. Wenn die besten Kräfte der Juden an solch Untergeordnetem sich zerarbeiten, wie kann man verlangen, dass die Christen Respect vor jüdischer Wissenschaft haben sollen?"

<sup>37</sup> *CB*, cols. xlv n. 41, 1633 ff., 2131 ff.; *BHB*, pp. xiv n. 1; xxiv, xxxf., *HB*, III, 41, 61 f.; VIII, 11, 50 f., 117 f.; XII, 68; XXI, 16; *GS*, I, 216 f., 624 ff.; *Bolletino italiano degli studi orientali*, 1876, 153 f. Not being seriously interested in the philosophy of Jewish history, he mentioned Krochmal only casually, as when he wished to illustrate the impact of Hegelianism on recent Hebrew letters. But he collaborated with Zunz in the preparation of the posthumous edition of the *Moreh nebukhe ha-zeman*. Cf. *FE*, p. 32; *CB*, cols. 1589 f.; and Zunz's introd. to Krochmal's work. Cf. also Simon Rawidowicz's introd. to his ed. (Berlin, 1924), p. 219 n. 1; and his "Zunz's Notes on the Edition of the *Moreh nebukhe ha-zeman*" (Hebrew), *Keneset*, VII (1942), 378 n. 1.

lack of thoroughness." On other occasions he emphasized, "We honor in Geiger the spirit, which he knew how to detect everywhere" and, paradoxically, even praised him for belonging "to those productive savants who in their scholarly investigations of ancient letters do not lose sight of the present and its trends, indeed frequently find in the latter the mainspring and standard for the former." He constantly welcomed Geiger's collaboration with him in his bibliographical journal and relished in particular Geiger's measured, but sustained, attacks on Graetz's historical approaches. On Geiger's passing in his early sixties, he wrote two highly appreciative obituaries.<sup>38</sup>

He also greatly appreciated the work of Solomon Munk, whom he slightly envied his independent scholarly position on the payroll of the French government. Although he disliked Munk's election to membership of the Paris Academy as a result of a rumored pro-Jewish demonstration in connection with the Mortara Affair, and resented Renan's replacement by Munk at the Collège de France because of the former's religious liberalism, he was convinced that, were it not for anti-Jewish discrimination, Munk would have had a prior claim on the chair at the Collège.<sup>39</sup> Steinschneider wrote also appreciatively of a number of other contemporaries.<sup>40</sup>

<sup>38</sup> *HB*, I, 30, 123; XIV, 133 f.; XVII, 79 f.; and above n. 18. His first reaction after Geiger's death was to publish a complete bibliography of Geiger's works and a brief description of the manuscripts left in the estate (*ibid.*, XIV, 134), but he seems to have left the execution of these plans to Abraham's son, Ludwig, whose appeal for the loan of biographical materials he mentioned *ibid.*, XV, 52. Unfortunately Ludwig Geiger in publishing a volume of his father's letters omitted, out of consideration for that mythical personality, the "general reader," the "technical" communications to and from Steinschneider. Cf. A. Geiger's *Nachgelassene Schriften*, Berlin, 1875-85, V, p. vi. Cf. also *ZHB*, IX, 119 ff.

<sup>39</sup> *HB*, I, 125; VII, 10; IX, 17 f. Strangely St. claimed priority over a suggestion by Munk to Reinaud which the latter published in 1842, while his own statement appeared in 1848 and his preparations had not begun before 1844. Cf. *BM*, 1895, 26.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. e. g., *CB*, col. xlv n. 41; *HB*, III, 30 (Almanzi); II, 80 (Beer); VI, 108 f.; VIII, 8; XX, 73; *JBGW*, III, 58 (Benjacob; cf. also his review of Benjacob's *קונטרס דברים עתיקים* in *Zeitschrift f. d. rel. Interessen*, III, 196 ff., 274 ff., 399 f.; and Moses Schorr, "Aus einem Briefwechsel betreffend Ben-

On the whole, however, he was far more outspoken in his condemnation than in his praise. He hated scholarly lack of discipline and unreliability above everything else. He knew that "the struggle of earnest scientific endeavor against a misleading profession which strives after appearances is, in its essentials, the same everywhere and at all times, much as the particular facts and motivations may differ from one another according to periods and localities, varying stages of culture or individual disciplines."<sup>41</sup> In "charlatanry" he saw, indeed, the major menace to Jewish scholarship.

For this reason he was deeply incensed at a personality like Israel Joseph (or Israel ben Joseph), styled Benjamin II. A Rumanian Jew of the old type, Israel Joseph undertook extended journeys through Asia and Africa in the years 1846-55 and later spent several years in America. He recorded these journeys in successive volumes under the picturesque name of Benjamin II, in memory of the great medieval traveler from Tudela. At first Steinschneider was prepared to withhold judgment, since he had not seen the first volume and was awaiting publication of the second. But he protested against the casual remark in R. Gosche's review (in the *Zeitschrift für allgemeine Erdkunde*) that Benjamin II was "equipped with that happy gift of observation which, in the case of travelers, can replace the lack of strictly scholarly equipment." In his opinion a genuine travelogue presupposed fine scholastic and critical abilities. After familiarizing himself with Benjamin II's publications he decided to take a

jacob's Thesaurus," *Jewish Studies . . . Kohut*, pp. 543 ff.); *HB*, XII, 90; XX, 4; XXI, 93 f. (Berliner); *FE*, p. 22; *HB*, XV, 133 (Frankel); *JBGW*, IV, 24 (Halberstamm); *HB*, XIII, 3; XVIII, 18; XX, 55; XXI, 99 (Jellinek); XVIII, 31 (Lazarus); XV, 133, 135 f. (L. Löw); XX, 138 (Malbim); II, 102 f. (Reifmann); XII, 68 (Della Torre); XVI, 98 f. (I. H. Weiss). On his relations to David Cassel, Harkavy and Neubauer, cf. Marx, *EJB*, pp. 172 ff. As an illustration, however, of his early strained relations with Neubauer we need cite but his "Abfertigung" of a passage in the Oxford bibliographer's essay in the *AZJ*: "'Das Berliner bibliographische Orakel selbst . . . hat diesen neuen ק"ט adopted.' Diese Zeilen enthalten eine unverschämte böswillige Lüge," *HB*, VIII, 32.

<sup>41</sup> "Wissenschaft und Charlatanerie unter den Arabern im neunten Jahrhundert," *Virchow's Archiv für pathologische Anatomie*, XXXVI (1867), 570.



stand, however uncharitable his attack may have appeared even to those who saw in Benjamin but a poor deserving mendicant. "We believe," he exclaimed, "that today we must demand for the science of Judaism as much — even more — exactitude as for any other science. We do not believe that Jewish literature is an orthopedic institution, a *charité* or hospital for cripples, disabled and unemployable persons." He was doubly irked, therefore, by Benjamin's growing popularity among princes and populace alike and by his securing many letters of recommendation from reputable Christian scholars. "If Niebuhr and Seetzen," he exclaimed, "had appeared as 'Marco Polo' or 'Mandeville II,' they probably would have received *Laufpässe*, rather than letters of recommendation." He was completely startled by the "American humbug" of the *Pacific Messenger* of San Francisco welcoming Benjamin as one of the greatest living scholarly travelers, the world-renowned colleague of Alexander von Humboldt. Unrelentingly he wrote in his obituary notice, "The man's death cannot change our opinion about his publications. Their content has absolutely no scientific, critical value, for he completely lacked scholarly or writing ability and all his books were prepared by others."<sup>42</sup>

The latter accusation, that of plagiarizing almost became Steinschneider's life-long obsession. He even denied the fact that in the Middle Ages literary property was treated with considerable latitude by Jewish, Christian and Muslim authors alike. "The notion of literary honesty," he contended, "has always been interpreted subjectively from one or another extreme point of view, and one must hold individuals, rather than periods or classes responsible for it." He also, with almost visible glee, cited Azulai's safeguards for literary property.<sup>43</sup>

Eliakim Carmoly became a recurrent target of these accusa-

<sup>42</sup> *HB*, I, 37, 51 f.; II, 12 f.; III, 80; VII, 61; *GL*, pp. 14 f. Benjamin's popularity highlighted, in his opinion, the corruption of contemporary journalism, "indem es den jüdischen Journalen so recht bequem gemacht wird, für die Unterhaltung ihrer Leser zu sorgen, unbekümmert um Wahrheit und Wissenschaft," *ibid.*, III, 9. Cf. however, his considerably milder critique of Jacob Saphir's travelogue, *ibid.*, XIV, 115.

<sup>43</sup> *HB*, IV, 10; VI, 31.

tions. A complete record of Steinschneider's polemical references to Carmoly's works would doubtless fill a sizable pamphlet. He followed therein Zunz's lead. In two letters addressed to him in 1853 the revered master had referred to someone as a faker whose name was perhaps Eliakim and, then, asked Steinschneider how he could inquire "why a falsarius should be called Eliakim." In this life-long feud, Carmoly hit back time and again. For example, in the "Annalen der hebräischen Typographie von Riva di Trento" (*Ben Chananja*, 1864; 2d ed. Frankfurt, 1868) Carmoly not only vigorously assailed the "disreputable fabricator of catalogues," but what hurt most, pointed out numerous serious mistakes in Steinschneider's early essay on Jewish typography. The latter could only expostulate by claiming that most of these errors had already been corrected in his *Bodleian Catalogue* and complain that "ever since 1840 Carmoly practices the art of correcting older writings on the basis of their authors' later publications." So certain was he of Carmoly's wrongdoings that he repudiated all possible excuses. When a writer (*MGWJ*, IV, 106) tried to apologize for Carmoly's work on Eldad the Danite, Steinschneider declared him to be "no judge of forgeries by so great a master." Even thirty years after Carmoly's death (1905) he declared that "to try to defend the *Histoire [des médecins]* is a downright sin against criticism."<sup>44</sup>

<sup>44</sup> Marx in *PAAJR*, V, 136 f.; *JL*, p. 289 n. 2a, 292 n. 42; *CB*, col. 815; *HB*, VII, 113 f.; *JBGW*, III, 61; *ZHB*, IX, 119 ff. He summed up his grievances in his uniquely vindictive obituary notice: "Am 15. Februar kehrte auch zu Frankfurt a. Main in 'die Wahrheit' ein der ehemalige Rabbiner in Brüssel, Elijakim Carmoly (ursprünglich Getsch Sulz aus Colmar), nachdem er dieselbe durch Fälschungen aller Art und freche Plagiate in zahlreichen Schriften und Artikeln verläugnet und misshandelt hatte. Obwohl seine, durch Belesenheit und Dreistigkeit unterstützte, alle Kritik verhöhnende Tätigkeit, schon vor einem halben Menschenalter warnende Stimmen (Zunz, Geiger u. A.) wach gerufen, fehlte es doch nicht an Männern (Jost, Fürst, Löw und Andere), welche seinen hebräischen und französischen Artikeln Verbreitung verschafften.... Als er den Geist aufgab, hatte letzterer ihn selbst längst aufgegeben.... Wenn es aber die Aufgabe der Kritik ist, 'der Wahrheit die Ehre zu geben,' so bleibt dem Andenken Carmoly's kein Segen der Gerechten übrig," *HB*, XV, 134. This notice and similar ones on the death of Fürst and others naturally created widespread resentment, and St.

Only slightly less irate and persistent were Steinschneider's attacks on Julius Fürst. At first, during his brief sojourn in Leipzig, he seems to have been on friendly terms with the editor of the *Orient* with whom he collaborated for several years. The relationship cooled off perceptibly, however, and Steinschneider viewed with growing disapproval Fürst's bibliographical and historical and, to a lesser extent, also philological efforts. Typical is his comment of 1879, "Schorr's and Steinschneider's criticisms have not prevented Julius Fürst from expanding his history of Karaism into three volumes by virtue of repetitions, the dragging in of alien materials and other inappropriate procedures (1862-69). . . . Of independent research there is no evidence whatsoever, not even in the crude errors which he commits on the aforementioned half-cited writings." On another occasion he rejoiced that the work had not been provided with an Index. "It is quite good," he said, "that not every uninformed person should be able readily to copy from such a book."<sup>45</sup>

Somewhat more measured, if no less venomous, were his attacks on the two great historians, Jost and Graetz. Steinschneider who, in his early essay on Jewish literature, had to reject various views expressed by the father of modern Jewish historiography, was touched to the quick when Jost counter-

himself felt obliged to explain this behavior to his students. Cf. Marx's testimony in *EJB*, p. 171. Such "exhibitionism" nevertheless alienated many thoughtful young men, e. g. Immanuel Löw. Cf. Kohut's report in *Studies . . . Freidus*, p. 115. I. Löw's distaste must have increased when he read, in St.'s obituary of his father, Leopold, the censure of "eine sich immer mehr vordrängende polemische Tendenz, deren Ausdruck, namentlich in der von ihm redigierten Zeitschrift *Ben Chananya* (1858-67) die Grenzen des wissenschaftlichen Ernstes nicht einzubehalten wusste," *HB*, XV, 135 f. Cf. also *ibid.*, III, 79; XV, 105 ff.; XVII, 78; *BHB*, p. xxxii n. 3; *Letteratura italiana*, pp. 11 n. 33, 13, 37 n. 150, etc. Cf., on the other hand, his defense of the bookseller, M. W. Schapira in *JBGW*, V, 34.

<sup>45</sup> *FE*, pp. 16 n. 33, 27; *CB*, p. xliii; *BHB*, p. xxviii; *JBGW*, II, 59; *HB*, VII, 30; VIII, 51; XX, 70. Fürst's book gave him also a welcome opportunity of attacking once again its publisher: "Mit der Herausgabe dieses, ohne alle eigene Quellenkenntnis und Kritik aus modernen Büchern fabrizierten Machwerks haben die 'Leiter' sich und der Zweckmässigkeit ihres Instituts ein unzweideutiges Denkmal gesetzt," *HB*, V, 134. Cf. also *PAL*, pp. 343 ff.



attacked sharply. Both in an article and in the *Geschichte des Judentums*, Jost pointed out numerous cases of "over-hastiness" and "hundreds of instances of mistaken names and wholly incorrect numbers" which had crept into that essay. Steinschneider also resented Jost's praise of Carmoly as "one of the most exact and careful experts." He inserted, therefore, a lengthy excursus on Jost, rather out of context, into the Introduction to his *Bibliographisches Handbuch*. It must be shown, he declared, "how far the writer, Jost, had already traveled away from the otherwise honorable man, Jost." His criticisms included such acute observations as,

Some forty years ago Jost had the courage of writing a history of the Jews, but he had generally the honorable "courage of an opinion," were it only of the then-prevailing prejudiced opinion against everything Jewish. Jewish *literature* had not yet been investigated by Zunz and others, and Jost derived his information chiefly from Christian, sometimes from bad tertiary sources, so long as they saved him the trouble of gathering the material by himself . . . . To write German at that time was in itself a meritorious task and Jost's negligent, incorrect style was good enough for a Jewish historian.

Now, however, Jost's work had greatly deteriorated. If his *Geschichte des Judentums* was supposed to have been written free of prejudice, it was indeed free, not only of any pre-judgment, but of any judgment whatsoever, Jost trying to mediate between opposing extremes and evading any decisive discussions. Shortly after this attack Jost died and, in his brief obituary, Steinschneider proved implacable: "He himself now belongs to history, which some forty years ago he had begun to cultivate, not without merit. His literary activity in the last years, however, was, unfortunately, such that we do not wish to combine the death notice with a criticism of these writings."<sup>46</sup>

<sup>46</sup> *BHB*, pp. xxxii ff.; *HB*, III, 117. He referred back to that attack on Jost, *ibid.*, II, 99 f.; III, 48. Of course, Jost's leadership of the Institute jointly with his former critic, Ludwig Philippson, gave St. the opportunity of attacking both. Cf. *BHB*, pp. xxxiv f.; *HB*, I, 51; II, 98 f.; XIV, 132. Cf. also his incidental sharp remarks in *HB*, III, 60, 80 n. 4, 104, etc.; and, more generally, S. W. Baron, "I. M. Jost, the Historian," *PAAJR*, I (1930), 7-32.

No less outspoken was Steinschneider's condemnation of Graetz. For a while their relations were fairly amicable, Steinschneider claiming that he had provided Graetz with some information which the latter abused. But their two temperaments and, especially, their approaches to Jewish history were wholly incompatible. The publication of the fifth volume of Graetz's *Geschichte*, which spoke disparagingly of "Dr. Zunz's more confusing than illuminating heap of notes and dry nomenclatures" greatly antagonized the large Zunz following. Graetz often took direct issue with such "note chasers" (*Notizenjäger*) like Steinschneider who was, therefore, not only glad to publish in 1860 Geiger's corrections to Graetz's fifth volume, but added a sharp comment of his own,

The author assigns to literature undue emphasis. He contends in his preface that he adheres only to the *primary sources*. This statement is to be understood as saying that in entire sections of his work he ignores the real source books, not casually but systematically. Our ordinary prose designates such proceedings as downright literary *dishonesty*.<sup>47</sup>

Three years later, on the publication of Graetz's seventh volume, Steinschneider lost all self-control. He found that this volume confirmed his dire predictions and that Graetz had gone so far "as to steal from his own master, Carmoly." With reference to M. Wiener's criticisms of Graetz in *Ben Chananja* he declared that their perusal will give the reader "an impression of the book's literary immorality, but not yet of the plagiarist's igno-

<sup>47</sup> Geiger, "Berichtigung einiger neuen Behauptungen," *HB*, III, 1 ff.; Steinschneider, *ibid.*, II, 28 f.; III, 104 f.; *JL*, p. 290 n. 18. Geiger's dislike of Graetz came to the fore already in his letter to St. of Aug. 29, 1853, in which he reported the receipt of "Jellinek's Sammlung של שו"ת under d. T. "בית המדרש" and of Vol. IV of Graetz's *Geschichte* which was the first to appear. He was certain of St.'s sympathy when he wrote, without giving it much benefit of doubt, that he had not yet opened it. "Die Belehrung, die ich daraus zu schöpfen habe, werden (!) mir noch zeitlich genug kommen." Cf. also St.'s biting remark in *HB*, V, 30: "Ueber Maimonides' offizielle Anerkennung als Rabbiner von *Kahira* (sic) wird man wohl auch noch die genaueren Daten aus HSS. von Carmoly zur Bestätigung der Conjecturen Graetz's abwarten müssen."

rance which comes most to the fore where Graetz makes a lot of noise about the alleged errors of unnamed authors and his own supposed discoveries in a style over which not only Klio must blush." The particular instances of these grave shortcomings, quoted by Steinschneider, fail to bear out these high-sounding denunciations, while Graetz's remark about Steinschneider's work here quoted, namely, that it was "thoroughgoing, though chaotic," squares far more precisely with the facts. It is even less forgivable when Steinschneider coupled here, as well as on other occasions, his attacks on Graetz as a writer with insinuations of a personal nature. He concluded his review by saying, "One must, indeed, congratulate the students of the Breslau Seminary for such a scrupulous guide on the road of history, whose oral lectures probably do not greatly differ from his writings."<sup>48</sup>

Steinschneider did not carry his ill-will to Graetz's pupils, however.<sup>49</sup> He praised, for example, Güdemann's *Geschichte des*

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, VI, 73 ff. He carried his dislike of Graetz to the extent of frequently quoting criticisms by other scholars and attacking Graetz's magazine articles and biblical studies, which he otherwise shunned. Cf. *HB*, III, 107 f.; V, 50 n. 1; VIII, 10; XI, 53 n. 4; XII, 131; XIV, 1, 77; XIX, 6 f.; XXI, 12; *JBGW*, I, 41; II, 59; III, 66; IV, 24 f.; V, 37; *GL*, pp. 8 f., 18, 22, 25, 58, 60, etc. On one occasion he admitted, however regretfully, that Graetz's major critic, Emanuel Schreiber, was not Graetz's equal, *JBGW*, IV, 25; and even that a conjecture by Graetz had been confirmed by N. Brüll, *ibid.*, II, 60.

<sup>49</sup> Personal reasons alone seem, however, to have made him refrain from extensively using the *MGWJ* as an outlet for his publications during the Frankel-Graetz regime. This is evident from both his more frequent appearances in that journal after Graetz's death and his occasional complaints about the unavailability of sufficient space for his writings. Cf., for instance, his "Occidentische Uebersetzungen aus dem Arabischen im Mittelalter," *ZDMG*, XXVIII (1874), 453 n. 1 concerning the suspension of the *Serapeum* which caused him to discontinue one of his publications; and his complaint that the *ZDMG* itself did not evince enough interest in Jewish studies, *HB*, II, 6 n. 2. For this reason he could not himself live up to the praise he bestowed upon I. Blumenfeld for exercising so much restraint in the *Oṣar neḥmad*, as not to appear in it at all, *ibid.*, III, 60 f. A mere perusal of *HB* shows how much space (fortunately for us) he appropriated to himself. Cf. also the pathetic remark in *ZDMG*, XXVIII, 456: "Der Stoff [for what was to become the *HU*] ist mir selbst so angewachsen, dass ich für die materiellen Mittel zu einer



*Erziehungswesens* on account of its "systematic order, fullness and partial novelty of the material... [which] lend the study permanent value." If he added the reservation that "in the interpretation of facts the apologist and conservative rabbi struggles with the dispassionate historian," this is indubitably a fair criticism of Güdemann's general approach. He also lauded Güdemann's history of the Jews in Magdeburg which at first appeared in *MGWJ* (1866). "Not enough of such monographs," he commented, "can appear for the time being." Although on occasion he warned the reader to check back the original passages quoted by Güdemann and once even attacked him outright, his comments were for the most part rather friendly.<sup>50</sup> He was also friendly and encouraging to David Kauffmann, Joseph Perles, and others.<sup>51</sup>

Most remarkable is his admiration of the work of such a relatively minor historian as Gerson Wolf. Since Wolf's researches were based on archival studies, such opening up of new sources to Jewish learning caused Steinschneider readily to overlook other shortcomings. Although he published M. Wiener's strictures on the reliability of Wolf as a copyist which concluded

Veröffentlichung meiner weitausgreifenden Arbeit vorläufig keinen Rat weiss, dennoch für eine sehr zweifelhafte Zukunft fortarbeite." We know that only the prize contest of the Academie des Inscriptions finally determined him to submit a completed ms. (cf. Joseph Derenbourg's letter about it published by Kohut in *Studies... Freidus*, pp. 119 f.) and even then he had to publish the German original at his own expense. Cf. *HU*, p. x. Undismayed by this continued lack of facilities, however, he untiringly collected materials for his *AL*, *GL* and other works over a period of several decades.

<sup>50</sup> *JBGW*, III, 60; *HB*, III, 5; VIII, 134. Güdemann's *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien*, 1876, elicited the following comment: "Sinnreiche Kombinationen, mitunter mehr verlockend als überzeugend, und an der Bibel respektvoll stille stehend," *ibid.*, XVI, 124. Cf. also *ibid.*, XIV, 16, 45; XXI, 45, 99, 115, 125; *ZHB*, VII, 118 ff.; *JQR*, XV, 312.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. *HB*, I, 33 f.; VIII, 136; XVIII, 32, etc. Although he was sometimes impatient with Kaufmann's overflowing enthusiasm, he occasionally admitted that "K. versteht es aber, mit seiner Begeisterung den Leser anzustecken, den ungläubigen mit Neid um den guten Glauben zu erfüllen." Cf. his review of *Die Haggadah von Sarajewo* in *OLZ*, I (1898), 308 ff. Cf. also below notes 77, 83. St. also encouraged such promising young scholars as Ignaz Goldziher and Immanuel Löw, cf. *ibid.*, X, 111; XXI, 55.

with the condescending hope that Wiener might soon have the opportunity of praising not only Wolf's zeal but also his care and thoroughness, Steinschneider continued to praise "the diligent and conscientious author [who] continues to exploit archival materials for the benefit of Jewish history."<sup>52</sup> He also commended, more or less warmly, other new source studies by Jewish and non-Jewish scholars.<sup>53</sup>

These numerous criticisms of contemporary writers were not only the effect of Steinschneider's bad temper. He felt that the science of Judaism was still too young and that it had become the prey of ambitious, unscrupulous and unlearned students who were much too complacently treated by the leaders and encouraged by their great popularity with the uninformed public. He considered it his duty to stand guard over his chosen fields of study and to keep out all trespassers.<sup>54</sup>

Unfortunately, partly because of this expenditure of verbiage on polemics — to our mind mostly exaggerated and often unnecessary polemics — he tried to save space by excessive

<sup>52</sup> *HB*, II, 107; III, 87; IV, 3 ff. (Wiener's criticisms); VI, 139 f.; VII, 108; VIII, 112, 137; XX, 89. At the same time he thought highly of Wiener. Cf. his aforementioned quotation from Wiener's critiques of Graetz and his brief obituary in *HB*, XX, 138.

<sup>53</sup> Cf., e. g., *HB*, XVIII, 81 (Barbeck); II, 66 (M. A. Lewy); XVII, 82; XIX, 124 n. 2 (Loeb); XIX, 77 (Löwenstein); I, 110 (Oelsner); XVI, 36 (Osimo); XVIII, 132 (Pesaro); XVIII, 127; XXI, 104 (Saige, with reference to his own article in *REJ*, V, 277 ff.); *JBGW*, VI, 40 (De Soignie); *HB*, XIV, 116; XXI, 45 (J. M. Zunz). Cf. also his remarks on Arsène Darmesteter's family, *ibid.*, XV, 3; and on Ch. D. Lippe's bibliographical lexicon, *ibid.*, XXI, 15. On the other hand, he spoiled his friendship of many years with Meyer Kayserling (cf. above and *HB*, XXI, 126; *JBGW*, II, 52) by an unbridled attack on Ludwig Philippson, Kayserling's father-in-law and subject of the latter's full-length biography; cf. Marx, *EJB*, p. 174.

<sup>54</sup> The following passages may serve as further illustrations of this attitude: *HB*, XXI, 53; *GL*, pp. 41 f. (Gaster); *HB*, III, 66 f. (Goldenthal); *HB*, XXI, 3; *JBGW*, IV, 27 (Ch. M. Horowitz); *HB*, XXI, 15; *JBGW*, IV, 26 (D. Joel); *HB*, XXI, 122 (Luncz); XX, 42 (Picciotto); XX, 74 f. (Schlossberg); XXI, 129; *JBGW*, V, 35 (M. Schwab); *JL*, p. 292 n. 37 (Y. Schwarz); *HB*, XXI, 47 (Smolenskin). With reference to his attack on Goldenthal in *CB*, col. 1020 f. (then in the press), he explained to Geiger in his letter of March 25, 1855: "Solche Kerle muss man nur mit Knütteln kritisieren." Cf. on the other hand, his change of mind in regard to Schwab in *ZHB*, X, 184.

brevity in language and by the use of abbreviations. He did not even heed Zunz's early warning. "When you review Dukes," the master had written him on June 9, 1843, "please write somewhat more explicitly for us outsiders than you have done in the evaluation of the Cuzari—so that 'our people' should not obtain further excuses when one denounces their indifference toward Jewish literature."<sup>55</sup> Although he himself complained that abbreviations were "a particularly serious plague in neo-Hebrew literature," his own writings are filled with home-made abbreviations not always consistent and certainly not uniform from one publication to another. Some of these devices cannot even pretend to having saved much space. The writing, for example, of "Zz." for Zunz can hardly be justified on any ground, except the author's minor convenience.<sup>56</sup>

### 3. CONTRIBUTIONS

Directly and indirectly Steinschneider greatly enriched our knowledge of Jewish historiography. In the field of Jewish bibliography, perhaps history's most significant auxiliary science, he was the undisputed master. By discovering and describing ever new source material of all kind, especially insofar as it still was hidden away in manuscripts or rare editions, he constantly increased the store of information available to students of all Jewish letters including the specific area of Jewish historical literature.

His magnificent contributions to the history of Jewish scientists also had a great indirect bearing on Jewish historiography. He himself contended,

<sup>55</sup> Marx in *PAJR*, V, 118. In a letter dated May 16, 1844, Cassel also warned him, in behalf of Zunz, that he should beware of heaping details upon details in his articles for the *Realencyclopädie*, since this was not going to be a "Gelehrtenbuch." Cf. also *GL*, p. xi; his correspondence with Geiger and the authorities of the Bodleian Library who had objected to the lack of "brevity and perspicuity" in *CB*, cited by Marx in *EJB*, pp. 136 f.; and below n. 86.

<sup>56</sup> *ZHB*, VII, 91 (with Marx's supplement thereto, *ibid.*, p. vii); "Gab es eine hebräische Kurzschrift?" *Archiv für Stenographie*, 1877, nos. 466–67 (cf. Kohut's note thereon in his "Bibliography," p. xvi); "Talmid" in *HB*, VII, 16 ff. Even with respect to his private correspondence D. Cassel in a letter dated May 10, 1844, not unjustly called him "Papiergeizig."



The history of the Jews, i. e., of Jewry may be divided into political and cultural; the cultural into literary, scientific, and religious history. The latter includes dogmatic, ritualistic and halakhic aspects. The blending of these abstract fields into one another in their actual manifestation is particularly characteristic of Jewish history and is explainable only through its own criteria.

To be sure, he realized that he was not a scientist and that he lacked the specialized knowledge of a mathematician, astronomer or physician. His excuse was that "the number of those who combine the necessary substantive and linguistic knowledge is extremely limited in our days. Hence it is a constant task for philologists and bibliographers to place the material at the disposal of experts." He was even more seriously concerned about the legitimacy of designating any savant as a "Jewish" scientist, indeed about the existence of any truly "national" science. He quoted with relish Prof. Seyerlen's statement that "as modern philosophy had been introduced by a Jew [Spinoza] so had the great scientific movement of the Christian Middle Ages been initiated by another Jew [Gabirol]," and added, on his own, that still another Jew, Abraham bar Hiyya (Savasorda) had laid the foundation for Christian Europe's study of geometry. But he immediately qualified his statement, "The more one penetrates into the details of all exact and empirical sciences, one increasingly realizes the importance of the individual, as against the undeniable influences of birth (nationality, language and fatherland)." With reference to Jewish medicine, in particular, he admitted that the direct connection among the Jewish physicians of various countries had practically ceased, and expressed doubt whether the religious and legal provisions of the Bible and Talmud had anything to do with hygiene or any other science.<sup>57</sup>

<sup>57</sup> *GL*, p. v; *Virchow's Archiv*, XXXVI, 573; LII, 341; "Arabische Mathematiker mit Einschluss der Astronomen," *OLZ*, IV (1901), 91; *ZHB*, VIII, 152 ff. Cf. also his review of Lucien Leclerc's *Histoire de la médecine arabe* in *Deutsches Archiv f. Geschichte der Medizin*, I (1878), 356 ("Ref. muss von vornherein seine Unfähigkeit betonen über eigentliche Geschichte der Medizin ein Urteil abzugeben"); his somewhat bolder declaration in his study of "Die Metaphysik des Aristoteles in jüdischen Bearbeitungen," *Jubelschrift*...

Despite these hesitations he spent a lifetime in collecting data on Jewish mathematicians, astronomers, medical men, etc. When, upon the completion of his magnum opus, the *Hebräische Uebersetzungen*, he pathetically wrote that taking leave of a lifetime's work is almost like taking leave of life itself, he had the great comfort of feeling that he had made signal contributions to every phase of medieval Jewish cultural history. In all his works, moreover, he included converted Jews, insofar as there was reason to believe that they had received their early education within the Jewish community. Somewhat inconsistently, he also tried to explain the large number of Jewish mathematicians by the peculiarities of the Jewish mind. Arguing against the facile assumption that the concentration of Jews on commerce and usury had stimulated their interest in mathematical sciences, he pointed out the relative absence of Jewish writings on the subject of mechanics and added, "People excluded from public life and, to a certain extent (owing in part to their ceremonial law) also from social life, will naturally turn to more *abstract* objectives. Even today Russian Jews delight in inventing counting machines.

Zunz, Berlin, 1884, p. 1 ("Wir müssen hier der Versuchung widerstehen, in das Gebiet der Geschichte der Philosophie selbst abzuschweifen, zu welcher unser Versuch gelegentlich einiges weniger bekanntes Material liefern wird"); and his obituary of Olry Terquem (Zarfati) whose expert knowledge of the history of mathematics was, in his opinion, greatly vitiated by the "ignorance of Hebrew palaeography," *HB*, V, 95. Understandably he was even more skeptical about the connection between the achievements of modern Jewish scientists and the evolution of Judaism. Cf. his caustic remarks in *ZHB*, X, 187. One can readily imagine, therefore, his wrath over the uncalled-for editorial note accompanying an essay on Maimonides in the same *Deutsches Archiv*, II (1879), 463 ff. The influence of all Semitic peoples, including the Arabs, the editors wrote, "in den Wissenschaften und Künsten im Allgemeinen bloss ein conservativer, conservierender und weiterbildender, aber kein productiver [ist], indem das Erfindungs- und Entdeckungstalent, sowie der Geist der Initiative ihnen abgeht." Cf. *HB*, XX, 37. St.'s interest in the history of science evidently emerged from his bibliographical preoccupations. During their joint preparation of the *Realencyclopädie* it occurred to neither Cassel nor himself that he be entrusted with any of the projected articles in this field. Cf. also St.'s reminiscences half a century later concerning the difficulties he had had in preparing *JL* to secure significant information about the scientific branches of Jewish literature. Cf. *BM*, 1893, 65.

The profitless art of chess playing, i. e. of abstract combination, has produced a number of Jewish champions even in modern times." On the other hand, mathematics, astronomy and astrology have penetrated the Jewish ritual and liturgy, and hence become historical forces shaping Jewish life far beyond the narrow sphere of scientific research. Even in the stricter confines of Jewish historiography, Steinschneider might have added, contributions by such scientists as Abraham bar Hiyya or Zacuto were far from accidental. Certainly in the borderline area of Jewish chronology, where legal and ritualistic interests impinged upon those of both history and astronomy, the interlocking of science and historiography was often perfectly evident.<sup>58</sup>

The Middle Ages were Steinschneider's main area of specialization. In his *Geschichtsliteratur* and other writings he paid relatively little attention to the ancient world. He had very

<sup>58</sup> *HU*, p. xxiv; *BM*, 1893, 68 ff.; 1894, 99; 1895, 19; "Schach bei den Juden" in Van der Linde's *Geschichte . . . des Schachspiels*, Berlin, 1873, pp. 155-201. Cf. his review of G. Wertheim's *Die Arithmetik des Elia Mizrachi* in *MGWJ*, XLI (1897), 96. Cf. also F. H. Garrison, "Moritz Steinschneider as a Contributor to the History and Bibliography of Medical Literature," *Contributions . . . Emanuel Libman*, New York, 1932. Although on more than one occasion St. professed his belief in the unity of the human mind, he made little effort at integrating Bar Hiyya's and Zacuto's scientific outlook and method with their historical works. In the *Megillat ha-megalleh* the former has advanced what we may call an outright "astrological conception" of Jewish and general history. Nevertheless St. disposed of his work in a brief paragraph inserted in the "Appendix" to his *GL*, p. 81. He should at least have been alerted to its importance by his own discovery of the great influence this book had exercised on the outlook of Don Isaac Abravanel, however much he disliked that "uncritical eclectic" and "fine plagiarist." Cf. his "Apocalypsen mit polemischer Tendenz," *ZDMG*, XXVIII (1874), 633; *PAL*, pp. 375 ff. Cf. also *ibid.*, pp. 307, 341, 350; *GS*, I, 327 ff., 333 f. Only his utter aversion to all astrologers, "deren Anschauungen wohl mit Recht der Vergangenheit übergeben werden" (*ZDMG*, XXVIII, 631) was at the root of this conspicuous neglect. Zacuto, to be sure, was treated extensively (*GL*, pp. 88 ff.), but his scientific achievements were merely mentioned here in passing. At the same time, St. greatly regretted that interest in chronology, long kept alive by its halakhic relevance, had steadily declined until it was completely shoved aside in Joseph Karo's legal code. Cf. *BM*, 1896, 109. Cf. also *CB*, cols. xiv ff., xxxvii ff., 706 ff.



little to say, for instance, about the achievements of biblical historiography, not even mentioning the Chronicler's work to which Zunz had devoted a detailed and truly searching investigation. Occasionally he would drop a remark like that referring to Prof. Fausto Lasinio's address on the study of the Bible text which he hailed as a sign of Italian liberalism. In commenting on Nöldecke's *Ueber die Amalekiter* he found therein mainly the proof that one ought to place little reliance on Arabic records concerning biblical subjects.<sup>59</sup>

Apart from his relative unfamiliarity with the controversial literature on the Bible, he had objective scientific reservations concerning biblical criticism as practiced in his day. Fully recognizing its importance, in fact emphasizing that the main challenge to modern theology was not materialism but modern criticism, he felt, nevertheless, that there was something basically wrong with these contemporary approaches to Scripture. Not only Renan but also "sound" German scholars seemed to him to be arguing in circles. Following Zunz's example who, in a private letter to him had indulged in an unbridled attack on Ewald, he too, took issue with Ewald's theories both as a Jew and as a scholar. Commenting on R. Dozy's *Israeliten in Mekka*, in which the author had utilized Geiger's theory concerning the conscious alterations of the biblical text, he stated,

<sup>59</sup> *HB*, V, 57 ff.; VII, 31. It is doubtful whether he would have mentioned Lasinio's address, were it not for his personal appreciation of the Florentine librarian to whom he later dedicated his *PAL*. Cf. also his "Anfragen und Bemerkungen über einige Handschriften der *Medicea* zu Florence an Herrn Prof. Lasinio in Pisa gerichtet," Kobak's *Jeschurun*, VI (1868), 92-102; and *ibid.* (Hebrew), VIII (1895), 66 ff. Even in his fine terminological study of the term "scale" (*ibid.*, IX [German], 87 f.) he used the book of Job merely as a background for its medieval commentators. Similarly, notwithstanding his clear realization that the book of Daniel was the fountainhead of the whole medieval apocalyptic literature and messianic speculation, he was more interested in its subsequent exegesis, "which may be considered a segment of world history," than in the book itself. Cf. *ZDMG*, XXVIII, 628. It is not astonishing, therefore, that, when approached by Delitzsch for some information in connection with a new edition of the Septuagint, he concentrated mainly on supplying data concerning the use of Greek by the Jews of medieval Greece. Cf. *HB*, XV, 37.

I do not doubt for a moment that Geiger himself would object to the consequences drawn here from his theory of the "internal historical evolution." . . . Here one finds in addition that stark positivism with which Ewald, Hitzig and others publicly offer their hypotheses as history . . . . Even if the old textual forgeries were proved, one would have the more carefully to examine the new texts produced on the basis of "internal history," as that alleged history itself is largely produced in turn by these texts.

We have seen that Geiger himself did not escape the brunt of his accusation that, once having adopted a theory, all facts of ancient history had to be pressed into its mould.<sup>60</sup>

<sup>60</sup> *HB*, II, 5; VII, 105, 124; Marx in *PAAJR*, V, 125. His dislike of Ewald must have been reinforced by Geiger's comments. In an undated letter received by St. on Sept. 23, 1860, Geiger wrote: "Ich denke, dass die זלזולים, welche ich mir von Ewald zuziehe, mir zu כפרה dienen werden; aber ich werde ihn doch immer weiter streicheln." On June 13, 1862, Geiger added, "Dass sich Ewald blamiert, so oft er eine jüdische Schrift bespricht, versteht sich von selbst." Cf. also Geiger's "Das Studium der nachbiblischen Literatur unter den Christen," *HB*, III (1860), 77 ff. St. objected, especially, to lower criticism on account of its extreme subjectivity, pointing to Graetz's commentaries on the books of Ecclesiastes and Song of Songs as a particularly "abhorrent example." Even Geiger's reconstructed *Urschrift* was based, in his opinion, on the far-fetched assumption that "der ängstlichen Masora eine lange Periode willkürlicher Entstellungen vorangegangen, wie sie wohl an keinem anderen Buche historisch nachgewiesen ist," *HB*, XII, 131; XVII 79 f. Higher criticism, on the other hand, seemed to him undermined not only by the vicious circle of its argumentation, but also by the total inability of the critics to agree on any fundamental issue. In his various, though on the whole rather restrained, criticisms of Wellhausen he sharply rejected the latter's admission that certain hypotheses must be postulated without direct evidence. On another occasion, referring to Wellhausen's (and Kuenen's) brief survey of the major trends in the criticism of the Pentateuch since Bleek, he inquired: "Wie steht es nun mit jenen positiven Resultaten, zu welchen die kritische Schule so viel Aufwand von Fleiss und Scharfsinn verwendet hat? Kaum in wenigen Hypothesen über die Grundquellen und deren Bearbeitung sind die Hauptvertreter einverstanden und ihren ersten Ansichten treu geblieben, selbst über die Methode wird scharf gestritten . . .," *HB*, XV, 30 f.; XVIII, 82 f. Cf. also *ibid.*, XIX, 56 f.; "An Introduction to the Arabic Literature of the Jews," *JQR*, IX (1896-97), 235 f. Of course, he was least impressed by theories focused about the allegedly peculiar traits of the ancient Semites, which were called upon to explain certain crucial difficulties in biblical literature. Cf. *HB*, III, 44; XI, 55; XV, 60 and above n. 11. On the

For these reasons he was reluctant to discuss ancient inscriptions which contained valuable historical data. He felt that he had to explain his refusal to include medieval tombstones inscriptions in his major historiographic work, by the fact that he had already listed elsewhere the large relevant literature. He also realized the need "of a complete collection of ancient Jewish epigraphic sources." But when it came to individual inscriptions he found the Mesha stone too unreliable to justify conclusions for Hebrew palaeography. The Shiloam inscription he dismissed by reference to the numerous grammatical errors discovered by Nöldecke in Sayce's reconstruction. The publication of an Eshmunaziride inscription merely elicited his remark that it required a lengthy commentary. "I confess," he added, "that this kind of Hebrew appears to me more remote than the assumption that we deal here with a non-Hebrew vocabulary."<sup>61</sup>

He was only slightly less hesitant about voicing opinions on the early post-biblical period. He knew well enough how important the study of the Talmud was in the whole structure of

other hand, he also disagreed with such fundamentalist evasions as when Güdemann called Eve "a biblical personality." Cf. *ibid.*, XVI, 124. On occasions he attacked a Jewish scholar like Bacher for failing to indicate the composite nature, e. g. of Psalm 119. Cf. *JQR*, XVII, 559.

<sup>61</sup> *GL*, p. vii n. 2; *HB*, XVI, 56; XIX, 79; XXI, 95, 104 f. Cf. also *ibid.*, p. 122. To medieval tombstone inscriptions, however, he devoted an interesting, though brief summary in his "Allgemeine Einleitung," *JQR*, XVI, 374 ff., followed by a lengthy bibliographical list (*ibid.*, XVII, 564 ff.), which includes a few other items. Similarly, his attack on M. A. Lewy's *Geschichte der jüdischer Münzkunde* (*HB*, V, 134) was not the result of his disparagement of numismatics as history's auxiliary science (cf. his brief remarks in *JQR*, XV, 328 f.), but of his dislike of the Institute's popularizing efforts: "Hat es denn aber irgend einen vernünftigen Zweck, dass sich Kreti und Pleti für Münzkunde interessiere und etwas davon zu verstehen sich einbilde?" He was somewhat more skeptical, at least in his earlier years, about the value of comparative linguistic studies, for, unlike that of the postbiblical literature, the language of the Bible seemed to him to show few outside influences. Cf. *FE*, pp. 1 f.; *BHB*, p. ix; and his comments on M. A. Lewy's *Phönizische Studien* in *HB*, VII, 7. On the other hand, he conceded the value of popular and pedagogic presentations of biblical history, provided they preserved the vigor of the original texts. Cf. *HB*, II, 27 (with reference to the Bunsen Bible); III, 13 f.



Jewish learning. In his second annual survey prepared for the *JBGW* he declared that "one cannot study the history of the Jews on the basis of sources without due consideration of this remarkable work of literature [the Talmud]." It had also been, he stated, up to recent times the very foundation of Jewish life. For this reason he felt impelled to give a cursory review of the scholarly investigations of the Talmud in the course of the preceding thirty or forty years. One cannot help feeling, however, that this review, though not completely devoid of merit, clings to the surface. There are only occasional fine "asides," as when he criticized Emanuel Deutsch for having "insinuated modern concepts into the Talmud." He constantly belabored modern talmudists like Frankel and Fassel for showing little understanding for a truly historical approach. He also took issue with the statement by a reviewer of Bacher's *Agada* that, if subjected to an historical analysis, "the talmudic literature loses completely its peculiar character." Steinschneider retorted that history was not called upon to conserve the peculiar character of its sources.<sup>62</sup>

When he tried, however, to summarize, on his own, the historic outlook of the talmudic sages, his presentation became "chaotic," as Israel Lévi called it. He must have been as much at a loss in reconstructing the talmudic outlook on history, as he professedly was in trying to recapture the scientific contributions of that period. He disliked the usual generalization that the "Talmud" held such and such views, since these views were, as a rule, expressed by hundreds of different sages, acting under different impulses over a period of a millennium. But he saw

<sup>62</sup> *HB*, I, 5; X, 166 f.; XVIII, 78; *JBGW*, II, 53 ff. Cf. his somewhat inconsistent criticisms of Hamburger's *Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud* and his apprehensions that J. Levy's talmudic dictionary might be attempting to combine the simple task of translation with a far more ambitious encyclopedic array of quotations. Cf. *HB*, XV, 103; XVIII, 32 f.; *JBGW*, VI, 44. On other such critical comments cf. *HB*, VII, 122; XX, 5, 60; XXI, 3. While criticizing, however, Beer's *Leben Abrahams nach der Auffassung der jüdischen Sage* as a "hybrid" of edification and scientific inquiry, he admitted the legitimacy of a free rendition of the Agadah. Such free translators, he declared, "sind selbst die Haggada und der Midrasch unserer Zeit," *HB*, II, 100.

no practicable alternative to this "geological" treatment of an entire historical stratum in Jewish thinking. At the same time he sharply denied the legitimacy of discussing talmudic ideas in terms of a "system" and contended that, for example, the Talmud's linguistic material belonged, in fact, to "the pre-history of grammar." In general, he was never too successful in broad "geological" reconstructions.<sup>63</sup>

The great importance of the vast extra-talmudic literature, too, was freely admitted, but he never subjected it to critical examination. For example, he found Raffaele Garucci's *Cimitero degli antichi Ebrei* very interesting, but admitted that the book "moves in a sphere and presupposes the knowledge of a literature which are completely alien to me." This unfamiliarity did not prevent him, however, from unkindly commenting on Graetz's brief study of Jewish catacomb inscriptions in southern Italy. Schürer's monograph on the Jewish communal organization in ancient Rome elicited but the timid suggestion that a comparison with talmudic and medieval data might have rendered the author's conclusions somewhat more certain. He dismissed rather curtly Freudenthal's still basic investigation of the Hellenistic Jewish historians preserved by Alexander Polyhistor, finding it "of more general interest" to examine the same author's theory concerning the influence of an alleged "Hellenistic midrash" on the Palestinian and Babylonian exegesis. More explicitly he commended the volume, *Eran* by F. Spiegel. "The outward relations of the science of Judaism," he declared, "are so many and varied that it is impossible for anyone to pursue even a significant part thereof, particularly in monographs devoted to lesser, as yet unfinished researches. The more welcome, therefore, is every comprehensive survey of recent results." Without

<sup>63</sup> *GL*, pp. 1 ff.; *BM*, 1893, 67 f.; *HB*, X, 165 f.; XX, 4; Lévi's review of *GL* in *REJ*, LIII (1909), 160. Cf. also *FE*, p. 21. At the same time St. realized the focal importance of "tradition" in ancient life and letters, and admired the interpretations given to it by Geiger and, with reference to parallel developments in the Muslim world, by A. Sprenger. Cf. *HB*, V, 66; VII, 125. He was perfectly aware, however, of the non-acceptance of this interpretation in Orthodox circles, both Jewish and Christian. Cf. his remark on Sprenger in *PAL*, p. 9 n. 2.

arrogating to himself any judgment concerning the sources, he merely wished to emphasize Spiegel's "praiseworthy care" in the use of documents.<sup>64</sup>

Curiously, despite his constant awareness of the great historic significance of Judeo-Christian theological controversies, he maintained almost complete silence in regard to their origin in the New Testament period. Occasionally, as with respect to Friedländer's essay on Melchizedek and the Epistle to the Hebrews, he pleaded unfamiliarity with the sources. He protested against Renan's and Strauss's studies of the life of Jesus because he sensed in their racial antipathy "a more or less conscious tendency to punish the mother for the daughter one wishes to cast away." In fact, he saw therein a valuable object lesson against the "recent belief that one performed a service to the science of Judaism by recommending it as a source for the history of Christianity." He censured even his great friend, Franz Delitzsch, on the publication of the latter's excellent Hebrew translation of the *Epistle to the Romans* for "wasting his erudition on so fruitless and, from the strictly scholarly viewpoint, senseless undertaking."<sup>65</sup>

Steinschneider's comments on Josephus are equally unrevealing. He considers this basic source of ancient Jewish history more as a background to its medieval paraphrase, the *Yosippon*, than as the work of the greatest Jewish historian before the nine-

<sup>64</sup> *HB*, VI, 102; VII, 33; XIV, 10; XIX, 79; *JBGW*, III, 66. Even in his special monograph, "Zur Alexandersage," *HB*, IX, 13-19, 44-53, he analyzed carefully *Yosippon* rather than any ancient records. Cf. also his critical comments *ibid.*, I, 123 (Geiger's essay on the Ecclesiasticus); and XIX, 6 f. (Graetz's *Das Königreich Mesene*).

<sup>65</sup> *JBGW*, V, 42; VI, 38; *HB*, VII, 59; XIII, 19; XVII, 2. While suspending judgment on M. Rahmer's *Die hebräische Tradition in den Werken des Hieronymus* until its completion, he went off to the more familiar field of Saadiah's and Hai's knowledge of the Koran, *ibid.*, IV, 12. On his relations with Delitzsch, cf. in particular, the latter's remarks on their collaboration in the edition of Aaron of Nicomedia's *Eṣ Hyyim* (1841); and the letter of recommendation of July 18, 1846 written by Delitzsch in support of St.'s application for Prussian naturalization and published by Marx in *Jewish Studies . . . Kohut*, pp. 512 f. (D. stressed here St.'s "respektvolle Stellung zum christlichen Glauben").



teenth century. His failure to treat of Josephus in his *Geschichtsliteratur* where he deals with a great many ephemeral chroniclers, may be explained by his exclusive concern in this volume with Hebrew sources. But even here the problem of the Aramaic original of the *Jewish War* would have merited some attention, as would the modern Hebrew translations of Josephus' works. In fact, in his critical comment on Kalman Schulman's translation of Josephus' *Life*, he himself mentioned that *Against Apion* had first been translated into Hebrew before 1566.<sup>66</sup>

His interest in modern history was likewise very limited. It was typical of his other publications when, in his history of Jewish mathematicians, he decided to relegate the period of 1801-40 to the Appendix, "for I am not sufficiently familiar with the literature." His lectures on Jewish historiography, too, usually ended with a brief sketch of modern writings to the days of Mendelssohn or the end of the eighteenth century. Only occasionally did he venture to extend it to 1840 or even 1900, although here he certainly could not profess equal unfamiliarity with the sources. In fact, while inserting in 1858 a column, "Die Vergangenheit," into his journal, he declared, "For us this [part] goes up to 1857." With all his opposition to apologetics he also emphasized time and again the virtue of making investigations relevant for contemporary life. We have seen that Geiger's work was, in his opinion, enhanced in its value, because it was oriented on contemporary problems. As a matter of record, however, he did not consider much of the research devoted to the nineteenth century as being of a really scholarly nature. He believed, for instance, that France was a happy country, because it no longer had a Jewish question of practical significance. Hence, its scholars did not have to justify the previous restrictions and could devote themselves to an impartial investigation of the Jewish past in their country. On the other hand, Germany's flood of anti-semitic or pro-Jewish writings had

<sup>66</sup> *HB*, II, 10 f.; III, 47; IX, 16 f., 44; *GL*, p. 89 (p. 24 erroneously quoted). Cf. also *FE*, p. 22. Even Frankel's essay on a subject so close to his heart as "Juden und Judentum nach römischer Anschauung," *MGWJ*, IX (1860), 125-42, induced him merely to compile a brief, far from satisfactory bibliographical list of studies on this subject, *HB*, III, 50 f.; V, 81 f.

produced nothing of scholarly significance. What is more, with his acute sense for detail, he dimly realized that he could not possibly hope to master the vast amount of information available for the modern period with the same degree of precise knowledge he commanded with respect to the more limited survivals of medieval letters. Once he expressed almost pained surprise on the publication in the *REJ* of archival studies pertaining to the Revolutionary period. "Our lengthy report," he concluded, "shall prove that even in regard to the most recent period there are still large treasures dormant in archives." He had an uncomfortable suspicion of the paucity of medieval manuscript collections when compared with the mountains of manuscripts assembled in modern archives.<sup>67</sup>

As a result of this dichotomy he limited his work in this field to such occasional bibliographical summaries as those concerned with antisemitic publications during certain years, pamphlets on the blood libel kept alive by the controversy over August Rohling's writings and the Tisza-Eszlar affair, or selections from bibliographical works referring to Russian Jewish history.<sup>68</sup> He could caustically comment on the trial of Sebastian Brunner vs. Ignatz Kuranda or on Heine-Am-Rhyn's *Kulturgeschichte*

<sup>67</sup> *BM*, 1893, 67; *GL*, pp. viii f.; *HB*, I, 3; *JBGW*, III, 59, 69, 72; IV, 28; VI, 47. His underestimate of the vigor of French antisemitism in the 1880's was shared by many complacent observers in France itself until their rude awakening during the Dreyfus affair. How unjustified this complacency was may be seen from the pertinent recent studies by R. F. Byrnes, E. Silberner and Z. Szajkowski in *JSS*, VIII-X.

<sup>68</sup> *HB*, XIV, 20 f., 87; XX, 29, 76; XXI, 11, 47, 126, 130; *JBGW*, VI, 39; *AL*, p. xii n. 1; *ZHB*, IX, 186. He regretted, on the one hand, that the sixty and more German pamphlets and articles published during a year had produced nothing of historical and scholarly value and, on the other hand, felt in regard to such apologetic writings, as Güdemann's *Kinderschlächter* that "wer nicht belehrt sein will, den werden auch die heutigen Schriften nicht belehren," *JBGW*, II, 53; *HB*, XXI, 125. Cf., however, the more hopeful Foreword to his new edition of Zunz's *Damaskus*, Berlin, 1859; and the note on the events of 1775 in his "Ein Blatt der Geschichte," Brüll's *Populärwissenschaftliche Monatsblätter*, III (1882-83), 8-10. In mentioning the new impression of Menasseh ben Israel's *Mikveh Yisrael* he underscored the Spanish editor's prefatory remarks. "Die Deutschen müssen 1881 eine Toleranzpredigt aus Madrid zu hören bekommen!," *HB*, XXI, 128.



*des Judentums*. Pointing out that author's ignorance of Hebrew he asked, "In what other field would one dare to write a history of culture without knowing the main language?" He evinced particular interest in the oath *more judaico*, since for nine years he had been professionally engaged in its administration. Despite the customary contempt for the backward East-European Jews he sympathetically recorded the grievances of Polish Jewry under Alexander II and condemned, in particular, the anti-Jewish abuse of governmental statistics. Discussing I. Loeb's *La situation des Israélites en Turquie, en Serbie et en Roumanie*, he expressed regret that the book "has not yet become of mere historic interest."<sup>69</sup>

On the other hand, he listed a compilation of Prussian laws concerning Jews not only because of its practical aspects, but also because "it will retain its value as material for history." He even mentioned such reports as those of the newly formed Anglo-Jewish Association and inquired about its future relations to the Board of Deputies, "whose task has all but ended with Jewish equality." He was much disturbed by George Elliot's Zionism and Disraeli's racism, declaring that "Coningsby, Daniel Deronda and the like are products of the split between the Englishman's high appreciation of Judaism and his previous contempt for the Jews. Justice, even of an historical character, and humanity require different approaches under the modern outlook on nature and the world." These examples, which could be multiplied indefinitely, show that he was deeply puzzled by the cross-currents of modern life. Convinced liberal though he was, he was not too confident of history's ultimate verdict on his own period and merely hoped that some day it might find a

<sup>69</sup> *HB*, II, 15, 86; III, 86; VII, 80; XVI, 115; XVII, 82; XX, 84; "Literatur des Judentums," *ZHB*, I (1896), 17-22; Marx, *EJB*, p. 139. As a curiosity he quoted fully an excerpt from an African Hebrew manuscript predicting the downfall of the Christian religion in 1832-34. More in the nature of a curiosity he also compiled, jointly with M. Roest, a bibliography of Jewish patriotic writings under the title, "Zur loyalen und patriotischen Poesie und Andacht," *Israel. Letterbode*, V (1879-80), 33-39. Cf. *GL*, p. xi n. 5. His own view on these outpourings is best summarized in his sarcastic remark on a Hebrew poem published on the occasion of Radetsky's death, *HB*, II, 44.



future Kompert, who would weave around it as romantic a halo as that adorning the bygone days of the ghetto era in the writings of the contemporary novelist.<sup>70</sup> For himself, he often escaped from the perplexities of modern life and the confusion of the overwhelming torrent of modern letters to the relative security and quiet of medieval Jewish bibliography.

Here lay, indeed, his main strength. Despite his general recognition of the interrelations between Jewish and general history, he focused his attention only on materials available in Jewish sources. In a characteristic remark inserted in a reply to a subscriber he declared, with respect to the legend of the Wandering Jew, "This is a subject so totally ignored by the Jews that I have had no occasion to deal with it."<sup>71</sup>

This remark sounds the keynote of his *Geschichtsliteratur* and the incidental comments referring to medieval Jewish historiography scattered in his various writings. In fact, the title, *Geschichtsliteratur* is somewhat misleading. Although he thus called his course of lectures given twelve times during the years 1865-99, the more correct designation of the book was *Bibliographie der Geschichte bei den Juden*, which title it bore long after it had been sent to the printer.<sup>72</sup>

<sup>70</sup> *HB*, VII, 127; XVI, 77; XXI, 14, 57 f. Cf. also his criticisms of such publicist efforts as M. Auerbach and S. Salant's *Open Letter to Sir Moses Montefiore* which, because of an awkward note by Dr. Loewe, he condemned as a "literary humbug;" and his wish that Picciotto's *Sketches* were "weniger feuilletonartig," *ibid.*, XVI, 123; XX, 44. As late as 1858, when Benjamin Disraeli had already achieved great eminence as a statesman and writer, he curiously misinterpreted the latter's remark about his father's faith, *ibid.*, I, 132.

<sup>71</sup> *HB*, III, 120. He pointed out that in a dissertation on *Die Legende des Judenknaben*, E. Woleter "verfolgt die Ausbildung in allen Verzweigungen mit grosser Genauigkeit; einen historischen Hintergrund wusste er wohl nicht zu finden," *HB*, XX, 120. Cf. also above n. 25.

<sup>72</sup> In his *AL*, p. xxi n. 1 (Preface dated September 1902), he complained: "Meine Bibliographie der Geschichte bei den Juden, I. Hebräische Schriften, wird seit 1901 mit langen Unterbrechungen gedruckt, beim Abdruck dieser Zeilen sind 64 Seiten, 62§§, fertig." Cf. also *ZHB*, V (1901), 158: "in einer für den Druck bearbeiteten *Bibliographie* der Geschichte der Juden." As far back as 1878 he wrote, "Mit einer Zusammenstellung der Schriften über, und Quellen für jüdische Geschichte beschäftigt — wozu ich jede Nachweisung

The first volume dealing with the Hebrew sources was in the press from 1901 to 1905 and, although the material had been ready for many years, Steinschneider gradually lost interest in it. Beginning with §100 he transferred the editorial work to his pupil, Alexander Marx who carried it up to §123. From then on, owing to Marx's departure for America, the undertaking was continued by another disciple, Aron Freimann. Of course, both pupils worked on the basis of Steinschneider's manuscript, but put in a great deal of their own effort and learning and, at times, applied somewhat different methods. Upon completion Marx had a considerable number of significant corrections and additions, which he published in his review of the volume as well as in a special essay. Other pupils, particularly Poznanski and Malter, added numerous corrections of their own. The manuscript of a second volume devoted to Jewish historical literature in languages other than Hebrew consisted almost exclusively of titles. This bibliography of some 2000 entries was prepared for the press by Felix Kaufmann but, unfortunately, never saw the light of day.<sup>73</sup>

In his prefatory statement he made clear that Jewish historical literature was not identical with the literature of Jewish history. The former includes also Jewish records concerning events and developments outside the Jewish community. That is why he felt free to discuss, for instance, Joseph Hacoheh's general historical work, דברי הימים למלכי צרפת ובית אוטומאן התנ"ך or Abraham Zacuto's concluding section on world chronology in the same detail as their statements on the history of their people.<sup>74</sup>

unbekannten oder seltenen Materials mit Dank annehmen werde," *HB*, XVIII, 129. Cf., however, *ZHB*, VI (1902), 159: "in meiner Gesch. Lit."

<sup>73</sup> Cf. *GL*, p. x; Marx in *ZHB*, IX, 135-41; X, 149-56; Poznanski in *JQR*, XVIII, 181-90; Malter in *Jewish Comment*, XXII. Cf. also *ZHB*, X, 158. One must not attribute this disorganized form of publication exclusively to St.'s old age (he was eighty-nine years old when *GL* appeared). He had equally bad experiences with such earlier publications as *PAL* which was in the press from 1862 to 1877. Cf. his Foreword thereto and *ZDMG*, XXVIII, 627.

<sup>74</sup> *GL*, pp. vi, 93, 102.

On the other hand, he excluded, as a matter of principle, what he considered mere "materials" for Jewish history. The latter, he stated, "consists in proving the connection between sequences (the *propter hoc* in the *post hoc*). Documents, statutes, treaties, negotiations, controversies, electoral announcements and promulgations of bans (about which the positive religions must not throw stones upon one another from their respective glass houses), all these are material for, but not history as such." This line of demarcation is, of course, somewhat arbitrary. Steinschneider himself decided to include in his treatment, for example, the various medieval "memor books." In his other writings he showed keen awareness of the importance of a *codex diplomaticus* for medieval Jewish history, extensively listed and commented upon communal statutes even in far-off countries and collected references to such communal records for the use of future historians.<sup>75</sup> Had he merely summarized his own widely

<sup>75</sup> *GL*, pp. vi f., 36 ff. Cf. especially his "Gemeindestatuten," *HB*, VI, 42 ff.; VIII, 103; XVI, 32 ff., 57 ff.; "Ein Codex diplomaticus judaicus," *ibid.*, XVIII, 129 f. (with comments thereon by S. Löwenfeld, *ibid.*, XX, 13); "Zur Quellenkunde für Geschichte der Juden," *ZGJD*, II (1887), 150–53; and "Statuten," *ZHB*, VIII, 124–26. Cf. also M. Wiener's "Ueber das bisher vernachlässigte Quellenstudium der jüdischen Geschichte," *HB*, IV, 1 ff. (the prominent place given to this article in his journal shows St.'s vivid interest in the subject); and St.'s comments, *ibid.*, XXI, 87 (societies for the support of needy brides); XX, 55 (the Worms memor book, ed. by Jellinek); XXI, 116 (the medieval school ordinance, ed. by Güdemann); XVIII, 81 (urging renewed investigation of the Nuremberg documents); XX, 89 (Moravia); XVI, 40 (Ferrara); XVIII, 136 (Alsace); *Jeschurun*, VII (1871), 44–45 (Prossnitz); *MGWJ*, XXXIX (1895), 238–39 (Mecklenburg); *HB*, III, 48 (Danzig); XVII, 86 (Berlin, 1873–76); XV, 30 (Cleveland); XX, 80 (B'nai-B'rith documents), 117 f. (American Jewish statistics). Even in his studies of medieval Hebrew poetry he was interested in such communal aspects as the existence or absence of literary societies and circles. This was, in fact, the burden of his presentation of the "Zeitgenossen des Moses ibn Esra und Jehuda ha-Levi" in *Festschrift . . . Harkavy*, St. Petersburg, 1908, pp. 126–36. With reference to the statutes of the Vienna society for the support of needy students (1862) he stated, "Auch dergleichen wird einst als Material für Culturgeschichte dienen; ich erwähne daher die mir zufällig bekannten ähnlichen," *HB*, V, 39. It seems that he originally intended to include this type of documentary material in his compilation of historical records. In his aforementioned early reference to this project (*HB*, XVIII, 129 f.) he



scattered notes on these records, he would have greatly facilitated the task of social historians in recent decades.

After all, his work on Jewish historiography really consisted of just such strings of notes on various sources of Jewish history. Unmindful of the dictum quoted by himself that matters of this kind are "not counted but weighed," he did little weighing of the individual sources against one another. For example, Azariah de' Rossi, next to Josephus indubitably the outstanding Jewish historian of the pre-Emancipation era, is disposed of in a brief paragraph, probably because the bibliographical problems connected with his works had already been largely disposed of by Zunz, Rapoport, the editorial notes of Cassel and Benjacob and in his own summary in the *Bodleian Catalogue*. There is not the slightest intimation of the major historiographic problems such as have been discussed by the present writer. On the other hand, Azariah's lesser contemporaries were given far more elaborate treatment.<sup>76</sup>

wrote that in this connection "hat sich mir das Bedürfnis einer Sammlung alter Urkunden als Grundlage für die Geschichte der politischen, juridischen und sozialen Verhältnisse der Juden als unabweislich herausgestellt." It is to be regretted that he later changed his mind and that not only a full-fledged *corpus*, but even a mere bibliographical listing of all pertinent documents, is still but a scholarly desideratum. Certainly St.'s list of eight (!) entries under "Gemeindewesen," can not be sufficiently excused even by his admission, "dass ich hier nicht das Resultat eigener spezieller Forschung wiedergebe, aber auch die jüdische Geschichtsforschung hat sich mit den jüdischen Gemeindeverhältnissen bis in die neueste Zeit wenig beschäftigt," *JQR*, XV, 311; XVII, 546. Cf., on the other hand, *ibid.*, XV, 314 f.; XVII, 546 f., where, under the curious heading of "socialism," he listed a heterogeneous assortment of writings ranging from a British Museum manuscript on the Mantua *Hevrat rahmanim* of 1579, through various studies of the Jewish family, charities and occupations down to Kayserling's essay on sumptuary laws. Cf. also his somewhat grudging recognition that "in den letzten Jahren hat man die Geschichte der Juden in England mit grossem Eifer, nicht ohne Voreingenommenheit, verfolgt," *BM*, 1896, 82.

<sup>76</sup> *GL*, pp. viii, 107; *CB*, col. 747. Cf. also such incidental appreciative remarks as *HB*, III, 17; IX, 19; and S. W. Baron's "Azariah de' Rossi's Attitude to Life," *Jewish Studies* . . . *Israel Abrahams*, N. Y., 1927, pp. 12-52; and "La méthode historique d'A. d. R.," *REJ*, LXXXVI (1928), 151-75; LXXXVII (1929), 43-78.

Similarly after devoting six crowded pages to Yosippon (including attacks on Carmoly, Wellhausen and others), he briefly dismissed the *Chronicle of Ahimaaz*, cavalierly disposing of Kaufmann's fine analysis. We have seen that Abraham bar Hiyya's major historical work was relegated to a brief note in the Appendix as were most travelogues, except those of Benjamin and Petahiah which were assigned brief paragraphs in the main treatment.<sup>77</sup>

His interest in Yosippon is justified, in part, by the importance he rightly attributed to legends which had overgrown the historic traditions. "Legends and sagas," he declared, "in their peculiar course through various periods, countries and nations, are of considerable interest to the investigator. Their relations to literary and cultural history, to philology and archaeology are often manifest, but in other cases can be ascertained only through more searching inquiries and comparisons." Rather inconsistently, however, he mentioned Gedaliah ibn Yahya, the other Jewish historian who preserved for posterity a vast amount of Jewish folklore, chiefly as a target for attack. With full approval he quoted Joseph Solomon del Medigo's pun on the title of Ibn Yahya's book as the *Shalsholet ha-Shekarim* (Chain of Lies instead of Chain of Tradition). Referring to Kaufmann's essay on a source of one of Gedaliah's statements, he emphasized,

Gedaliah remains not only a plagiarist (e. g., from Azariah de' Rossi) but also an uncritical compiler. The fact that he sometimes copies texts literally and sometimes omits miracle tales while indulging in them with relish on other occasions is a part of it all. The word 'tradition' applied to stories written down later has menacing implications for history. One should not deny, however, the value of detecting sources, be they merely sources of errors.<sup>78</sup>

<sup>77</sup> *GL*, pp. 28 ff., 35 f., 49 ff., 83 ff. Cf. above notes 58 and 64.

<sup>78</sup> *HB*, IX, 13; *JBGW*, V, 38. In *CB*, cols. xxxix, 1002, he pointed out that even credulous Azulai did not consider Gedaliah trustworthy. In *GL*, p. 109, he admitted, however, that a new edition of the *Shalsholet*, provided with critical notes, was much to be desired. He also made good use of Ibn Yahya's materials, e. g. in *PAL*, pp. 306, 308, 320. Cf. also *JL*, p. 290 n. 22; *HB*, III, 42; VI, 61; "Zur Frauenliteratur," *Isr. Letterbode*, XII (1888), 62 f.

At the same time he brought together much valuable information pertaining to such classics of Jewish historiography as the *Seder Olam rabba*, Sherira's *Epistle*, Ibn Daud's chronicle and the historic apologia by Ibn Verga. He called attention to such theretofore neglected historians as Meiri and Capsali. He also frequently spoke with great admiration of Yehiel Heilprin's *Seder ha-Dorot*. "Heilprin's investigations about Jewish chronology," he declared on the occasion of a new edition of the work, "enjoy a deserved reputation, especially his detailed investigations about the talmudic sages. Entire sections thereof have been taken over into modern publications without their source having been betrayed by more than the usual 'cf.'"<sup>79</sup>

Far more restrained was his praise of Azulai's *Shem ha-Gedolim*. He was not only discouraged by what he considered Azulai's gullibility, as revealed particularly in the latter's itinerary, but also by the disorder in the original presentation, corrected only by Benjacob's alphabetical arrangement. That is why he was doubly irked by an unauthorized reprint of Benjacob's edition which he considered a serious infringement upon the copyright then owned by Benjacob's impecunious widow. On the other hand, he was sharply critical of Aaron Walden's *Shem ha-gedolim he-hadash* which dealt largely with the biographies of modern East-European rabbis and hasidic leaders and which, in his opinion, "lacked the comprehensive erudition of Azulai but greatly exceeded the latter in blind gullibility and timid superstition." He felt constrained to add, however, that "if the data supplied in this work, apart from the miracle tales, should prove

<sup>79</sup> *GL*, pp. 7 ff., 23 ff., 45 ff., 55 ff., 76 ff., 93 f., 141 f.; *HB*, II, 9; *JBGW*, II, 51; III, 65. Of course, many of his remarks in *GL* are a repetition or elaboration of data supplied already in *CB* under the respective authors. Cf. also his commendation of ever new efforts to secure a correct Sherira text, even if the author of the new study, J. Wallerstein, happened to be a pupil of Graetz (*HB*, IV, 13; the use of Graetz's copy is not mentioned here, however; cf. *GL*, p. 24); his remarks on Ibn Daud's biography (*HU*, pp. 368 f.); his objection to Kayserling's unconcerned treatment of Ibn Verga as an historical source: "das ist bedenklich" (*HB*, IX, 79); and his extensive use of Capsali's chronicle in his "Candia, Cenni di storia letteraria," *Il Mosé*, II-V (1879-82). Cf. also Kohut's note on the latter essay in his "Bibliography," p. xxx.



reliable, we would have to be grateful to the author. Only one of his ilk is familiar with this unsavory sort of literature which, after all, had become a portion of the history of unculture [Unkulturgeschichte].<sup>80</sup>

Next to these more or less major works of Jewish historiography, however, the various chronicles and even minor temporary records occupied much space in his presentation. The more obscure an author, and hence the less known in scholarly literature, the more opportunity he gave to Steinschneider to display his unmatched erudition and skill in detecting data in inaccessible books and manuscripts. He must have realized, for one example, that he was not really competent to deal with a problem like "Chmelnicki's March and the Number of Jews (1648)" without the knowledge of Polish and Russian sources and secondary literature, and yet he wrote an article under this title on the basis of Samuel ben Nathan's *Tit ha-yaven*. "I give here," he declared in 1864, "as raw material the names of the cities together with the number of the heads of families in the sequence of the source, as I have excerpted it in Oxford in 1851. I have been careful only in exactly reproducing the names and figures as written in my excerpts. . . . One will take it for granted that Polish names of localities are not likely to have left a Venetian press without serious injury."<sup>81</sup>

<sup>80</sup> *CB*, cols. xli, 758 ff.; *HB*, VIII, 8, 108 f.; *JBGW*, II, 51 f. St. communicated Abraham Berliner's report of 1870, in behalf of the bibliophile, H. Lipschütz, that a manuscript of Azulai's itinerary (since published by A. Freimann) had been in the possession of an Italian rabbi, "der es sorgsam bewahrt und es nicht veröffentlichen will, weil darin viele Ausfälle gegen manche Rabbiner und Gelehrte jener Zeit sich befinden," *HB*, X, 82 f.

<sup>81</sup> *HB*, VII, 36 ff. Cf. also his irate remarks on the news about the erection of a monument to the Cossack chieftain, *ibid.*, XIII, 16. Once again he was not consistent. He rationalized his failure to make extensive use of the Genizah materials, which had begun to revolutionize the entire outlook on Jewish history under early Islam, by defending his *AL* against Hirschfeld's strictures. "Hier ist zunächst," he wrote, "Geschichte mit Stoff confundiert. . . . Und alle jene bisher unbekannten Fragmente, was beweisen sie gegenüber den zusammengestellten Schriften der Klassiker? . . . Was Anderes, als dass sie meist unbekannt, weil einflusslos blieben," *GL*, p. viii. Cf. also *ZHB*, X, 89 f. The criterion of influence certainly was not St.'s usual standard.

## 4. MASTERY OF DETAILS

We thus see Steinschneider making a number of significant contributions to certain phases of Jewish historiography, rather than offering, in any way, a general history of Jewish historical literature. Here, as in most other works, he might have echoed Leclerc's introductory announcement to the *Histoire de la médecine arabe*, which he quoted in his review of that work. "Our history," Leclerc had written, "will be principally what one might call external, or bio-bibliographical history of Arab medicine. We believe that one must begin in this fashion when one deals with an almost completely new subject." And, as Steinschneider pointed out, Leclerc by virtue of his training as a medical man, Orientalist and literary historian was exceptionally well equipped to write the more important internal history as well.<sup>82</sup>

He himself fully realized the limitations of the bio-bibliographical method, particularly in Jewish studies. "Biographical data concerning the authors," he once wrote ruefully, "are very scarce, except in a few cases, for Jewish writers have, as a rule, lived a quiet cloistered life unless persecution or poverty drove them out of their seclusion." For this reason Jewish biographical treatments usually furnish "shadows rather than pictures." But being natively a pioneer in search of uncharted paths and byways rather than of the highways of scholarship, he felt that his primary responsibility was reliably to assemble those preliminary data on the life and work of the Jewish men of letters, without which all more searching analytical inquiries would resemble castles in the air.<sup>83</sup>

<sup>82</sup> Leclerc, *Histoire*, I, 11; Steinschneider in *Deutsches Archiv f. Gesch. der Medicin*, I (1878), 356 f.

<sup>83</sup> *BM*, 1893, 110; *JBGW*, I, 39. The peculiar difficulties of Jewish bio-bibliography are stressed, from another angle, in "Pseudo-Juden und zweifelhafte Autoren," *MGWJ*, XXXVIII (1894), 39-48. St. noted, therefore, with particular relish the preservation of such an early autobiographical account as that included in Shabbetai Donnolo's commentary on the *Sefer Yeşirah*, *BM*, 1896, 44. At the same time he felt that the career of a leading scholar often reflected the destinies of the whole generation, be it only in their common sufferings. He derided, however, David Kaufmann for extolling

Wherever possible, he refrained from discussing basic principles. Even the intriguing question as to why ancient and medieval Jews ever since the fall of Jerusalem revealed little historical interest and why, in particular under the Arab domination, they failed to emulate the vast historical literature of the Arab world, is dismissed in a few casual remarks.

Now that [he wrote in an early essay], through the Dispersion, a national history properly so-called, had ceased to exist, this feeling [of national pride] was necessarily confined to a pride in the intellectual powers of individuals. . . . In this the example of the Arabs could have but little influence; as their historical literature must have remained, for the most part, unknown to the Jews and there could have been no opportunity for imitation.

He failed to explain, however, why that literature remained unknown to the Jews, while, according to his own often stressed opinion, Saadiah, Hai and others had studied even the Koran. He offered no reason, for example, as to why Saadiah should not have known anything about the historical interests of Al-Mas'udi whom he had met personally. Neither is his other explanation more plausible, namely that the Jews of Muslim lands, having sustained few persecutions, felt little urge to describe their own history. In another connection, he himself admitted that the records concerning the Jewish *Leidensgeschichte* in Christian countries hardly qualify for inclusion in the category of historical literature. Here he resorted to another argument by saying that "feeling for and interest in developing history stem, as a rule, like imperialism, from the love of one's country." But he failed to explain why the love of one's people — and, as we have seen, he himself constantly harped on the theme of Jewish peoplehood — should not have served as an equally powerful incentive.<sup>84</sup>

Jewish scholars as "heroes." At this exaggeration, he declared, "konnte ich mich des komischen Eindrucks nicht erwehren, den die Bilder eines Herkules oder Achilles neben dem eines deutschen oder polnischen Klausrabbi machen müssen," *GL*, pp. vi, viii; *HB*, XVII, 32.

<sup>84</sup> *JL*, pp. 75 f.; *PAL*, pp. 313 ff.; *AL*, pp. xx f.; *GL*, pp. vii f.; *HB*, III, 113;



This strict adherence to details and aversion toward more general discussions induced Frankel, as early as 1846, to warn him against his "proneness in dubious cases to give more credence to dead codices than to the [testimony of] the clear living spirit." With more animus, Jakob Goldenthal referred later disparagingly to "such superficial literary activities which easily established one's scholarly reputation." Steinschneider replied by stressing Frankel's theologically restricted unhistorical approach and by sharply attacking the "ingenious chatter and fabrication of hypotheses" by Goldenthal and his like. For himself he definitely preferred the arduous road of "honest studies."<sup>85</sup>

Although highly sensitive to criticism, he did not budge from his chosen road. By endless labor and toil he produced work after work knowing well enough that "the pain in giving birth to a book is greater than that of giving birth to a child." He certainly had definite ideas as to how history ought to be written. In a characteristic passage, written in the last years of his long life, he declared,

The history of culture is the true aim of world history, for it is the aim of all intellectual endeavor. History is neither philosophic schematism (Hegel), nor political pragmatism (Rotteck); — how history of culture is to be written

Al-Mas'udi, *Kitab at-Tanbih*, ed. by Goeje, pp. 112 f. (in the French transl. by B. Carra de Vaux, Paris, 1896, pp. 159 f.). St. himself vigorously protested against the often-heard assertion that Maimonides "had no understanding for the history of nations and states." Cf. *HB*, XIV, 42 f.; and S. W. Baron, "The Historical Outlook of Maimonides," *PAAJR*, VI (1935), 5–113.

<sup>85</sup> Z. Frankel in *Zeitschrift f. d. rel. Interessen*, III, 465 f.; J. Goldenthal "Ueber einige Benennungen synagogaler Gesänge des Mittelalters," *Sitzungsberichte* of the Vienna Academy, XXXI (1859), 400, 405 ff. (with reference to his earlier essay, "Die neueste historische Schule in der jüdischen Literatur," *ibid.*, IX, 1852, 306–35, in which, however, he had reviewed the works of Dukes rather than St.); Steinschneider in *HB*, I, 5; III, 66 f.; V, 118; XV, 133; *JQR*, XVII, 577. Cf. also *HB*, I, 34 ("Es ist freilich in neuerer Zeit sehr viel vom 'Geist' die Rede, wo höchstens Gespenster spuken. . . . Merkwürdiger Weise sind diese 'Ritter vom Geiste' nicht selten irrende Ritter — was freilich nicht die Schuld des Geistes ist, — und noch häufiger ganz gemeine Wegelagerer oder ausgewitzte Schmuggler und schlaue Wiederverkäufer"); and Geiger's review of Frankel's *Entwurf*, *ibid.*, VIII, 37–39.

was shown us by Buckle (who has worked himself to death, however), as well as by Macaulay in a few chapters of his first volume.

In contrast to these excellent writers, he must have sensed, as Alexander Marx puts it, his own congenital inability to suppress a note. But what he wrote about his *Hebräische Uebersetzungen* holds true of most of his works.

I have first begun my investigations [he declared] for myself. There have always been men who have considered research an objective in itself, just as other men indulge in other pleasures. I write first of all for such readers, I mean persons who will look up here particular data. These readers I could call "recurrent" ["fortlaufende"]. This book has not been written for continuous readers.

To produce a useful reference work was, indeed, for him the epitome of scholarly attainment. When he wanted to praise to the sky Zunz's *Synagogale Poesie*, he felt that he could say no more than that "the book is not intended for reading, but for study and reference." In his endeavor to supply much-needed reference works he felt that he could appeal only to small selected groups of experts. More than once he expressed the wish that his books (e. g., the Leyden catalogue) should reach only those readers for whom they were written. We remember that he sharply condemned attempts at "confusing different circles of readers" via popularization. "There are areas," he reiterated, "which are never popular, because an understanding for them presupposes a certain type of training and an interest in them depends on a peculiar bent of mind." So sure was he, on the other hand, that the specialist in need of some specific information, would overcome all obstacles, that he did not even care to facilitate this task of consultation. Through some of his writings lurks an almost irrepressible contempt for the reader.<sup>86</sup>

<sup>86</sup> Hebrew letter to Jacob Benjacob published by Schorr in *Jewish Studies* . . . *Kohut*, p. 548; *JQR*, XV, 312; *HU*, p. xxiv; *Catalogus . . . Bibliothecae . . . Lugduno-Batavae*, Leyden, 1858, pp. xxiii f.; *HB*, II, 30; VIII, 137. Cf. also *ibid.*, V, 62; *ZHB*, VI, 182; IX, 157 f.; and above notes 24-26. He was, nevertheless, irked when Loeb explained to him the difficulty of securing a French

Certainly, he has attained his major objective. His formidable array of books and articles, which earned him Harnack's comparison with the "brazen-bowelled" Didymus of ancient times, has been consulted for many decades by legions of specialists in various fields. Few are indeed the nineteenth-century authors whose technical works have been so urgently needed in recent years as to find publishers ready to reprint them and a public eager to acquire and collect them. Not only was the *Bodleian Catalogue* reproduced in a photo-offset edition after three-quarters of a century, but some of Steinschneider's early writings of the 1840's and 1850's have seen the light of day again in Jerusalem shortly before the Second World War. With all their deficiencies in the light of our present knowledge, the prodigious notes of the great polyhistor on almost every phase of cultural, literary

edition of *JL* because "für unsere französischen Leser, die in diesem Gegenstand gar nicht eingeweiht sind, scheint mir das Buch etwas zu trocken und algebräisch" (Feb. 22, 1880). St. irately underscored the last four words. His documentation is generally so integral a part of his work that one may keenly regret, for instance, his decision to abstain from annotating his "Beiträge zur Palästinakunde aus neueren jüdischen Quellen," *ZDPV*, III (1880), 220-33, under the rather flimsy excuse that he had "bei den Lesern dieser Blätter vielmehr eine gewisse Kenntniss vorausgesetzt, welche jene überflüssig macht." Certainly a mere summary of parts of two Hebrew pamphlets, however rare, which St. had excerpted in Oxford thirty years before, was a scholarly "contribution" along the lines of least resistance. Cf. also his *ליקוטים מהכמה המוסיקה*, which appeared in the *Bet Osar ha-Sifrut*, I (1887), pp. xxix-xxxii, etc. It may also be noted that, for the sake of precision, he preferred to write in German or Hebrew, for "man schreibt genau so, wie man denkt, nur in der Muttersprache," *HU*, p. x. His compilation of *CB* in Latin was imposed upon him by the authorities of the Bodleian Library; cf. his comments cited by Marx in *EJB*, pp. 136 f. Curiously, however, he ventured to write his letters to Boncompagni, *Intorno ad alcuni matematici*, Rome 1863, in Italian, "già a me diletteissima fra le lingue moderne fino della mia fanciullezza" (p. 4), and to submit his lengthy "Introduction to the Arabic Literature of the Jews" to the editors of *JQR* in English (IX, 228). At the same time he was quite sensitive about whatever editorial operations were performed on his manuscripts in such journals as the *ZDMG*. Cf., e. g., *HB*, VII, 81. For this reason he also wrote to George Kohut with reference to the enclosed essay "Lapidarien" for the Alexander Kohut memorial volume: "Ich gestatte nur einen unveränderten Abdruck, sonst erbitte ich mir das Ms. zurück," *Studies . . . Freidus*, p. 87.



and scientific history of medieval Jewry have been an endless source of valuable information for several generations of scholars. Of course, as he sometimes said, he left to his successors much *מקום להתגדר בו*. But if in some areas Jewish scholarship has advanced far beyond anything envisaged by the founder, his contented reply would have been: *In magnis rebus voluisse sat est.*<sup>87</sup>

<sup>87</sup> Harnack's letter on his ninetieth birthday, published by Marx in *Jewish Studies* . . . Kohut, pp. 526 f.; *Der Aberglaube*, p. 3. St.'s remark in his "Apocalypsen mit polemischer Tendenz" (*ZDMG*, XXVIII, 627) sounded the keynote of many other publications as well: "Wenn dieser erste Versuch weitere Untersuchungen und Mitteilungen hervorruft, so hat er seinen Hauptzweck erreicht."

## SOME NOTES ON THE TRANSMISSION OF THE SEPTUAGINT

By ELIAS J. BICKERMAN

Professor Alexander Marx is not only a historian of his people but also and above all the faithful keeper of its book treasures and book-lore. As a true lover of books, he is interested in everything related to the object of his passion. This disposition of his mind encourages me to submit to his judgment in this anniversary volume, as a welcome means of showing my regard for him and his works, a few remarks on some bibliographical aspects of the first Greek version of the Book of Books.

The following abbreviations, in addition to the familiar ones, are used in citing authorities. *Bi* = *Biblica*; *Blau* = L. Blau, *Studien zum altthebräischen Buchwesen* (1902); *Freudenthal* = J. Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor* (1875); *HThR* = *Harvard Theological Review*; *JAOS* = *Journal of American Oriental Society*; *JBL* = *Journ. of Biblic. Literature*; *JPOS* = *Journ. of Palestine Oriental Society*; *JThS* = *Journal of Theological Studies*; *Kahle* = P. E. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza* (1947); *Kenyon* = F. G. Kenyon, *Book and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome* (1932); *Lieberman* = S. Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine* (1942); *MSU* = *Mitteilungen des Septuagint- Unternehmens*; *RB* = *Revue Biblique*; *REL* = *Revue des études latines*; *Swete* = H. B. Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (2nd ed. 1902); *Thackeray* = H. St. J. Thackeray, *The Septuagint and the Jewish Worship* (2nd ed. 1923); *Theod. Mops.* = R. Devreesse, *Le Commentaire de Théodore de Mopsue sur les Psaumes* (1939); *ZAW* = *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentl. Wissenschaft*. *LXX* = Septuagint.

The manuscripts of the Septuagint and the readings of its versions are quoted as rule from the so called larger Cambridge edition: A. E. Brooke, N. McLean, *The Old Testament in Greek* (1906-1940). Add: W = H. A. Sanders, C. Schmidt, *The Minor Prophets* (1927), a codex of the late 3d cent.; P. Fouad = W. G. Waddel, *JThS.* 1944, 158; P. 911 = H. A. Sanders, C. Schmidt, *l. c.* (Genesis, 4th c.) P. 957 = *Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library III* (1938) 458; P. 961 and 962 are Genesis Papyri; P. 963: Numbers and Deuteronomy; P. 964: Ecclesiasticus; P. 965: Isaiah; p. 967-8 Ezekiel, Esther, Daniel, as published in F. G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri* (1933-1937). The Ezekiel Papyrus however is quoted according to the edition of A. Ch. Johnson, H. S. Gehman, E. H. Case, Jr. *The John H. Scheide Biblical Papyri. Ezekiel* (1938). Two new leaves from P. 965: I. Bell, *P. Merton*, 2.

## I

We call the Greek Old Testament, as received in the Greek Church, "Septuagint". The Usage comes, as it seems, from the title *Vetus Testamentum iuxta Septuaginta* of the Roman edition of 1587, which remained, more or less amended, the standard text until the end of the last century. Thus, our usage comprises both the translated books and kindred works originally written in Greek, like Second Maccabees. Owing to this misconception we have now these strange amphibians, called "Septuagint Grammars," where examples are quoted pell-mell from Second Maccabees and such barbaric translations as let say Judges. If I mistake not, the Church Fathers, speaking of the Septuagint, referred to the translated books only.<sup>1</sup> But even this usage is improper and does not appear before the middle of the Second century C. E.<sup>2</sup> Originally, as Jerome points out,<sup>3</sup> the term referred to the five books of Moses only, translated into Greek, according to Jewish tradition, by the Seventy-Two interpreters under the auspices of Ptolemy II Philadelphus of Egypt (285–246 B. C. E.). How did the name of "Septuagint" come to designate the whole Greek Bible?

Written by the Jews, the Greek Bible was accepted as the Scripture by the Christians. Until the fifth century, at least, for Jews and pagans alike, the common form of a book was that of the scroll.<sup>4</sup> The Christians, however, preserved the Holy Writ in the form of the codex, that is the book with leaves. The reason for this anomaly has been often discussed.<sup>5</sup> I venture to suggest that it was technical. Since the reader had to unfold the scroll and to roll it up, as he proceeded, the normal length of a

<sup>1</sup> Cf. E. Nestle, in Hasting's *Dict. of the Bible* IV, 438.

<sup>2</sup> Justin (I *Apolog.* 31) is, probably, the first writer to ascribe the translation of the Prophets to the Seventy.

<sup>3</sup> Hieron. *ad Ezek.* V, 12–3 (*P. L.* XXV, 55).

<sup>4</sup> Kenyon, 94. Cf. C. C. McCown, *HThR*, 1941, 219; Blau, 37. A new evidence as to Jewish usage in Theod. Mops. *ad Ps.* XXXIX, 8, p. 248.

<sup>5</sup> See now P. Katz, *JThS*, 1945, 63, who suggests that the Christians, in using the codex, desired to separate themselves from the practice of the Synagogue.



roll was practically limited. Now, the Torah is a scroll of an extraordinary length. It contains about three hundred thousand letters.<sup>6</sup> For this reason, the Torah is wound on two sticks while a regular roll needed one only.<sup>6a</sup> But the Greek version of a Hebrew book, owing to the use of vowels, etc., is at least twice as long as the original. For this reason, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah each became divided in two volumes in Greek, while the Torah Scroll in Greek is the "Pentateuch" or "Five Rolls."<sup>7</sup> In this way, the Greek Old Testament of the Church consisted of some twenty-seven rolls. Add the books of the New Testament, and we are in the presence of a veritable *Bibliotheca Divina*. The Codex form gave to the ecclesiastical authorities the much desired means of bringing the Holy Writ within the compass of a few bindings. For instance, a single papyrus codex, (p. 967-8) copied ca. 200 C. E., included the contents of three rolls, at least, namely Ezekiel, Daniel, Esther. Bearing in mind the cohesive importance of the Scripture in the history of the ancient church,<sup>8</sup> and, on the other hand, the absence of fixed criteria by which to judge the canonicity of a book, we may easily understand the meaning of the codex as a means of unification and ecclesiastical discipline. Added to this was the fact that, unlike the Jews, the Church made no qualitative distinction between the Torah and the rest of the Scripture. On the contrary, the Church was much more interested in messianic oracles of the Prophets than in Mosaic legislation.

Thus, in Christian hands, the Scripture received the form of our printed books, which, of course, simply continue the medieval codex, while the Synagogue held and holds to the Scroll. In a Roman catacomb, a reader is represented in almost the same posture as the prophet of the Dura Synagogue. But while the Jew unfolds his scroll, the Christian turns over the leaves of his

<sup>6</sup> L. Blau, *Jewish Encycl.* XII, 196.

<sup>6a</sup> See TP Megilla I.11, 71d, TB Baba Bathra 14a.

<sup>7</sup> The term "Pentateuch" is said to be used first by the Gnostic writer Ptolemaeus, about 150 C. E.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. F. C. Burkitt, *Church and Gnosis* (1932) 22 and 126.

codex.<sup>9</sup> Thus, behind the apparent unity of the Christian codex, there was a diversity of Jewish scrolls of the Greek Bible, each scroll having its own particular history.

## II

The capital importance of this passage from scroll to codex for the history of the Greek Bible has been obscured by the fact that the text of our printed editions has been drawn from the great parchment codices which embrace the whole Septuagint: Codex Vaticanus, Codex Alexandrinus, Codex Sinaiticus. When Cardinal Carafa and his associates prepared the Roman edition of 1587, they based it mainly on the Codex Vaticanus, since this exemplar appeared as the oldest and best of all manuscripts at their disposal. The Roman editors learned this method of selection from Jerome and other Church Fathers, who, in turn, received it from Alexandrine philology. Since the errors naturally increase in the course of successive copying, the Greek philologists attached a particular weight to the testimony of some carefully written old exemplars. Modern editors of classics followed the same rule until and into the last century.<sup>10</sup>

In opposition to this practice, founded on accidental selection, classical scholars of the nineteenth century, following the lead of K. L. Lachmann (1793–1851) aimed at ensuring an objective standard in choosing between manuscripts and readings. Textual criticism became founded on a methodical "recension" of evidence. By some tests (such as the occurrence of significant common errors) the critic arrives at a classification of the at first sight confused mass of manuscripts into a few "families". Each "family" is constituted by (direct or indirect) copies of the same parent manuscript. These "ancestors," not traceable one

<sup>9</sup> R. Vielliaud, *Rivista di archeolog. crist.* 1940, 143. The *volumen*, which often appears on Christian monuments, is a feature borrowed from pagan art.

<sup>10</sup> On the Roman edition see Swete, 175–182 and now J. Ziegler, *Bi*, 1945, 37–51, who shows its dependence on the Aldine text, printed in 1519. On Jerome's textual criticism see now K. K. Hulley, in *Harvard Studies in Class. Philol.* 1944, 87. I note, by the way, that the rule of following the *lectio difficilior* is expressed August. *de cons. evang.* III, 7, 29.

to the other, are independent witnesses to the text of the "archetype", their common ancestor. As far as they disagree, the testimony of majority among them decides against an exceptional variant.<sup>11</sup>

Seduced by the achievements of this objective method, Paul de Lagarde, a German theologian (1827–1891) conceived the idea of applying the same technique to the edition of the Septuagint.<sup>12</sup> Jerome states that at his time, that is about 400 C. E., three forms of the Septuagint circulated in the East: Eusebius' edition of Origen's revision and the recensions of Hesychius and Lucian.<sup>13</sup> Scholars had often attempted before Lagarde to classify the extant manuscripts of the Septuagint in agreement with Jerome's statement. It was supposed, for instance, that the text of Judges in the Vaticanus represents the Hesychian recension and the text of Job in Alexandrinus that of Lucian.<sup>14</sup> But

<sup>11</sup> K. Lachmann, *Kleine Schriften* II (1876) 253 points out that his purpose is to establish an objective standard for deciding among various readings: nach Überlieferung ohne eigenes Urteil die Lesart zu bestimmen. The best modern delineation of this "genealogical" method is P. Maass' *Textkritik* in A. Gercke, Ed. Norden, *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft* I (3d ed. 1927). Cf. P. Maass, *Byzantin. Zeitschr.* 1937, 289. Very instructive is also E. K. Rand's paper on the text of the Vulgate (*HThR*, 1924). Further, cf. J. Andrieu, in *Mémorial des études latines* (1943) 458 and *REL*, 1946, 271. On the "new" approach, based on papyrus evidence, cf. G. Murray, *Greek Studies* (1946) 91; G. Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo* (1934). For the Greek Bible cf. F. C. Kenyon, *Recent Developments of the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible* (1932); H. I. Bell, *Recent Discoveries of Biblical Papyri* (1937) and the works quoted below nn. 17 and 18.

<sup>12</sup> Lagarde often refers to Lachmann's example. See e. g. *Symmicta* (1870) 138. Cf. A. Rahlfs, *Paul de Lagardes . . . Lebenswerk* (*MSU* IV, 1), 41.

<sup>13</sup> Swete, 80 reprints Jerome's statements. For their appreciation see Bardy's work quoted below n. 92 and H. Dörrie, *Zur Geschichte der Septuaginta im Jahrhundert Konstantins*, *Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wiss.* XXXIX, 1940, 57–110. This paper has only become accessible to me now, during proofreading. The author shows that the existence of the three principal recensions of the LXX, deducted from Jerome's statements, is very doubtful.

<sup>14</sup> F. H. A. Scrivener, *Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament* (4th ed.) II (1894) 211 and 224. Cf. Swete, 488. O. Pretzl, *Bi*, 1926, 233–69; 357–83 and Ch. M. Kooper, *JBL*, 1948, 63–68 offer new views on the relation between the two texts of Judges. L. Dieu, *Le texte de Job du Cod. Alex., Le Muséon*, 1912, 233–74.



Lagarde was the first to argue that the reconstruction of the three recensions known to Jerome may lead, by their comparison, to the archetype which lies behind them, that is the basic text of the Septuagint as it circulated about 200 C. E.<sup>15</sup> This aim of Lagarde has remained until to-day the goal, and his method the foundation, of the textual criticism of the Greek Bible.<sup>16</sup>

Now, this whole conception, as applied to the Septuagint, is based on some misunderstandings. In first place, the method of philological "recension" was invented for dealing with medieval manuscripts. As a rule, only a unique copy of a classic chanced to survive the Dark Ages and to transmit it to medieval clerics. For instance, common corruptions prove that some fifteen extant manuscripts of Pindar, copied in the XIII-XIV th. c. all go back to the same (lost) archetype. But there are extant about fifteen hundred exemplars of the Greek Bible or of some part of it.<sup>17</sup> How can it be supposed that these manuscripts from the Vaticanus, written in the fourth century, to the copies transcribed in the fifteenth century, all derive from the same unique ancestor, as the Lachmann's method postulates?<sup>18</sup>

On the other hand, in the times of Jerome (and after) the whole Bible was encompassed in big volumes, like the Vaticanus, the Alexandrinus, the Sinaiticus. That became possible only by the use of vellum codices, which begins ca. 300 C. E. only.<sup>19</sup> Previously, being written on papyrus, codices could not comprise more than a part of the Greek Bible; and in Jewish hands, as has been said, each book of the Septuagint had required a separate roll. Thus, behind the one volume editions of the fourth cen-

<sup>15</sup> P. de Lagarde, *Ankündigung einer neuen Ausgabe der griechischen Übersetzung des Alten Testaments* (1882) 22 and 29.

<sup>16</sup> On the present state of Septuagint research see J. L. Seeligmann, *Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egypt. Geselschap VIII* (1940), 350-90; H. M. Orlinsky, *On the Present State of Proto-Septuagint Studies* (offprint from *JAOS* 1941); Id. *Progress in Septuagint Research* in H. Willoughby, *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow* (1947), 144-148; Kahle, 132-179; P. Katt, *ThZschr.* 5 (1949), 1.

<sup>17</sup> G. G. Kenyon, *The Text of the Greek Bible* (1937) 38.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. E. C. Colwell, *JBL*. 1947, 109; 1948, 1.

<sup>19</sup> Kenyon, 114.

ture which Jerome had in mind we must visualize not another volume which is their common source, similar to the archetype of medieval copies, but a confused plurality of divergent papyrus rolls. In fact, Origen complains of the diversity of the copies he had before him.<sup>20</sup> In his time each parish and countless private persons had their exemplars of the Septuagint.<sup>21</sup> It is very remarkable that more than a tenth of all literary papyri of the third century C. E. discovered in Egypt are Bibles or other Christian books.<sup>22</sup> We may surmise that at the time of the great persecution of Diocletian at least every tenth Egyptian had already been won over to the new faith.

Nobody will hold against Lagarde that in his time he did not (and could not) realize the limitations of Lachmann's method. One wonders, however, whether the students of the Septuagint of to-day would cling to his plan and idea if they were abreast of the progress of classical studies. But by some illusion, they generally deal with the transmission of the Bible as a peculiar phenomenon, as if scribes did not use the same technique in transcribing any kind of book.<sup>23</sup>

### III

As we have stated, behind the one-volume manuscripts of the whole Septuagint lie Christian partial codices and separate Jewish rolls of each book. Among these Jewish rolls, the Pentateuch takes a particular place. According to the Jewish tradition, already recorded between 180-170 B. C. E. in Aristobulus' "Explanation of the Mosaic Writ", the Torah was rendered into Greek by command of Ptolemy II (285-246 B. C. E.).<sup>24</sup> Modern critics, wrongly, as I think, suppose that the Greek version of

<sup>20</sup> Orig. in Mth. XV, 14.

<sup>22</sup> A. Harnack, *Bible Reading in the Early Church* (1912) 53.

<sup>22</sup> C. C. McCown, *Biblical Archaeologist*, 1943, 27.

<sup>23</sup> For instance, a copyist of Enoch, being accustomed to letter writing, carried a mannerism of his trade over in his copy of Enoch. See C. Bonner, *The Last Chapters of Enoch in Greek* (1937) 14.

<sup>24</sup> Aristob. in Euseb. *Pr. ev.* XIII, 12.2. The date of his work follows from the dedication to Ptolemy Philometor as sole ruler.

the Torah originated in the Jewish community of Alexandria to satisfy the needs of the Jews who had lost the knowledge of the Hebrew. In any case, almost all critics are inclined to accept two statements of Jewish tradition, that the translation of the Torah took place during the reign of Ptolemy II in Alexandria and that the version was official.<sup>25</sup>

According to another Jewish author, the so-called Pseudo-Aristeas, who wrote some fifty years after Aristobulus, the original "rolls" of the version entered the royal library at Alexandria while an authenticated copy was received by the Jewish community of the same Egyptian capital.<sup>26</sup> The textual history of the Septuagint starts here. Some Christian authors (Justin, Tertullian) add that the original was still accessible in the Serapeum library in Alexandria in the second century C. E. This assertion, however, is worth no more than Justin's reference to the acts of Jesus' trial in Roman archives.<sup>27</sup> If Origen, Tertullian's contemporary, could have seen the autograph in his own city, he would not have hunted for trustworthy copies of the Septuagint through the whole Roman Empire. By the same token, the authenticated exemplar of the Jewish community must have been lost before Origen's time. Probably it was destroyed during the Jewish rebellion in the reign of Trajan. However, as Ps.-Aristeas states, the Jewish community lent its approbation to the version, acknowledged it as perfect and

<sup>25</sup> Kahle, 134 now argues as follows: Ps. Aristeas makes propaganda for the LXX, hence the latter was published about his own time, that is toward the end of the II c. B. C. E. But in the first place, Ps. Aristeas may have to defend the Authorized Version against new attacks. In his time, the grandson of Ben-Sira found fault with the existing Greek versions of the Bible. Secondly, and above all, Ps. Aristeas' work was not written as propaganda for the LXX. He rather used the historical event of the translation as the starting point of a tale intended to glorify Jerusalem. Incidentally, Ps. Arist. 30 does not refer to a previous careless translation of the Torah, as Kahle, 135 repeats, although he acknowledges that this interpretation does violence to the plain meaning of the Greek. In fact *σεσημανται* means *notare*, mark with writing, and Ps. Aristeas refers to Hebrew Mss. See *JBL*, 1944, 343. I add that Aristobulus (see n. 24) uses the term (*σεσημαγκάμεν*) in the same meaning: "note down."

<sup>26</sup> Ps. Aristeas, 308-11 and 317.

<sup>27</sup> Just. I *Apol.* 31; Tert. *Apol.* 18. Cf. Just. I *Apol.* 35 and 48.



under a curse forbade any alteration of its text. We may, thus, assume that at least the copies produced for public worship at Alexandria were controlled and collated with the official exemplar. The indirect tradition shows that on the whole the handing-on of the Greek Pentateuch had long been accurate to a surprising extent. For instance, in our manuscripts we read that Jacob "approached Chabratha to come into the land Ephratha" (Gen. 35, 16). That is a grotesque distortion of the Hebrew. But the Jewish historian Demetrius, writing during the reign of Ptolemy IV (221–205 B. C. E.) already had before him the same senseless text in his Greek Genesis. As is well known, the Hebrew and the Septuagint figures differ widely with respect to the ages of the Patriarchs. Demetrius' computations show that the whole chronological system of the Greek Pentateuch, from the Creation to the Exodus, as we have it in our codices, was already in the roll used by the same Demetrius.<sup>28</sup> One of the divergences between the Hebrew and the Septuagint noted in the Talmudic tradition is that according to Greek Genesis (2, 2), the Creation was completed in six (and not seven) days. The previously cited Jewish philosopher Aristobulus already takes this reading for the scriptural text and uses it for his discourse.<sup>29</sup> One of the strangest lexical oddities of the Septuagint is the use of the poetical term of abuse *κυνόμυια* (literally "dog-flies") to describe the fly-plague of the Exodus. The tragedian Ezekiel and the historian Artapanus, in the second century B. C. E., in their re-tellings of the Exodus, confirm the reading of our manuscripts.<sup>30</sup> The last instance: all known manuscripts

<sup>28</sup> Freudenthal, 40–43. The reading of Vat. in Ex. 16.17, while disagreeing with the Masoretic text, is confirmed by the quotation in LXX Is. 48.21. Cf. I. L. Seligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah (Mededelingen . . . Voraziatish-Egyptisch Genootschap* #9, 1948), p. 47.

<sup>29</sup> Aristobulus l.c. Talmudic statements on the Septuagint are translated in H. St. J. Thackeray, *The Letter of Aristeas* (1917), 89–95. Cf. A. Geiger, *Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel* (1857) 441–6. Comp. also V. Aptowitzer's article in *Ha-Kedem* II (1908), p. 11 seq. *ibid.* III (1909), p. 4 seq.

<sup>30</sup> LXX Ex. VIII, 25; Artapanus in Eus. *Pr. ev.* IX, 27; Ezekiel, 138 in *Ezekielis . . . Fragmenta* ed. J. Wienecke, Diss. Munster, 1931. Hieron. *Ep.* CVI, 85 notes: *κυνόμυια* iuxta Hebraicam intelligentiam . . . omne muscarum genus . . . quod Aquila *πάνμικτον* interpretatus est. Philo substitutes *σकुν*

and all versions of the Septuagint say that God promised Abraham that he would die "nourished in a good old age." The Hebrew text of Gen. 15, 15 says "buried," and the error in Greek is purely graphic: *τραφέις* for *ταφείς*. But Philo already used the alteration due to a scribal error as a theme to preach upon.<sup>31</sup> The error goes back to the archetype of our tradition.

On the other hand, the existence of private, commercial and unrevised (or arbitrarily revised) copies resulted, as in the case of the classics, in marked divagations from the common text. A Deuteronomy fragment of the second century B. C. E. (P. 957) offers four singular readings in some thirty lines. It is important to note that while one of the "canons" of modern textual criticism is to consider as authentic Septuagint the variant deviating from the Masoretic text,<sup>32</sup> the new papyrus exhibits singular readings which are closer to the Hebrew than the standard text. On the other hand, again as in the case of the classics, this earlier textual witness already supplies intentional corrections of supposedly wrong passages. For instance, Dt XXIII, 25 (26) dealing with grape-eaters in the neighbor's vineyard, says: "when you enter." The common Greek text renders that exactly as follows: *ἐὰν δὲ εἰσέλθῃς*. A corrector, in agreement with Ptolemaic law, conceived the action as trespassing and accordingly changed the verb. The quoted papyrus reproduces this alteration: *ἐὰν δὲ ἐπέλθῃς*. In Ex. 4, 10 Moses says that he is "not a man of words." How to render this idiom in Greek? The Septuagint manuscripts diverge: the oldest Uncials, supported by the Old Latin version, translate: *οὐχ ἱκανός εἰμι . . . λαλεῖν*. Some minuscules (and the so called Syro-Hexaplar version) correct

*πες* from LXX Ex. VIII, 12 while Sap. Sal. XVI, 9 simply uses the general term *μύια*. The vocable sometimes was used, as a name for flies, but the question remains why the translator has chosen this particular word to express the Hebrew idea of Egyptian plague. The plague he knew in Egypt was that of mosquitos (cf. Herod. II, 95).

<sup>31</sup> Swete, 478 (Philo, *Quis rer. div. heres*, 275). A. M. Honeyman, *Transact. Glasgow University Oriental Society* IX, makes a very plausible suggestion that the unintelligible reading *Ἀμαθείας κέρας* in Job 43.14 the corruption of *μάλθῃς κέρας*.

<sup>32</sup> Swete, 485, quoting Lagarde.

that into a more Greek expression: οὐκ εὐλαλος; some others into: οὐκ εὐγλωσσος. The poet Ezekiel, however, as well as Philo had before them the reading: οὐκ εὐλογος which has also been preserved in two Uncials (F and M) and in some minuscules.<sup>33</sup> Now, there is a nice question: is this reading the original one or an emendation made by a Jewish reviser in the second century B. C. E. in order to improve upon the uncouth original reading?

As in the case of the classics, the earlier quotations of the Septuagint often disagree with the standard text of later editions. For instance, at Gen. XVII, 16 the standard Septuagint, at variance with the Hebrew, refers to Sarah's son the promise that kings will descend from her. This alteration already appears in P. 961, of the third century C. E. But Philo, and P. 911 with him, go here with the Masoretes, and the same unorthodox reading has been preserved in a Byzantine manuscript (72 or m). However, in the next verse, Philo and P. 911 part company with the Masoretes. Another instance: Philo quotes Dt. VIII, 18 as follows: ἀλλὰ μνεία μνησθήσῃ. His Greek text of Deuteronomy represents a Hebrew original where the so called Infinitive absolute of the verb "remember" was used. Neither the Masoretic text nor the received Greek version supports the reading. But it is indirectly attested by the minuscules 19,108,118 as well as both Coptic translations which exhibit the doublet: γνώσῃ τῇ καρδία καὶ μνησθήσῃ. The Philonic text corresponds to the first part of this composite reading.<sup>34</sup> Quoting Num. XXVIII, 2 Philo renders the Hebrew term "qorban" by προσφορά while the received text of the Septuagint says for it: δῶρον. Philo is supported by Paul's Letter to the Ephesians (5, 2). On the other hand, quoting the same passage, Philo omits the anthropomorphism ("sweet savour unto Me"), which also troubled the Rabbis. It seems that a Jewish reviser of the Septuagint dropped

<sup>33</sup> Philo, *de sacr. Abr.* 12; *quod det. pot.* 38; *V. Mos.* I, 83. According to the Cohn-Wendland edition it is only in the last passage that manuscripts of Philo offer variant readings: εὐγλωσσον, εὐλαλον intruded from the Septuagint tradition.

<sup>34</sup> Philo, *de leg. all.* III, 217; *de sacr. Abeli*, 56.



the objectionable clause. It is also absent from two very important minuscules (g or 54; n or 75).<sup>35</sup>

Further, mention should be made of some instances in which Philo uses different texts of the same Biblical passage. For instance, in Gen. XVIII, 17, Philo reads, in agreement with the received Septuagint, that God called Abraham "my servant." But in another work, he comments on the same passage as if it says that God called Abraham "my friend." The latter idea reappears in the Epistle of James (2, 23).<sup>36</sup>

Philo's use of the Septuagint requires a new study; we also need a new critical edition of the fragments of Jewish Hellenists. Nevertheless, it may even now be stated that in Jewish hands (ca. 200 B. C. E.-100 C. E.) the original version, although protected by the Community had already entered upon a steady process of divergence created by blunders of scribes and particularly by conscious alterations of revisers trying to improve upon the received text. The classicists know that in the same period the texts of Greek classics did not fare much better in the hands of revisers and careless copyists.<sup>37</sup>

#### IV

The Greek version of the Torah was followed by translations of other Jewish books. It is a pity that we rarely have the evidence to date these translations. Some formulae used in I(III) Esdras point to the composition of this work in the second

<sup>35</sup> Cf. H. E. Ryle, *Philo and Holy Scripture* (1895), 243; Aug. Schroeder, *De Philonis . . . Vet. Test.* Diss. Greifswald, 1907, 44. On rabbinical scruples with regard to Num. XXVIII, 2 cf. A. Marmorstein, *The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God* II (1937), 77.

<sup>36</sup> Ryle, *l. c.* quotes Philo, *de leg. all.* III, 27 and *de sobr.* 56. On Philo's deviating quotations cf. Kahle, 140-5.

<sup>37</sup> For instance, Dionysius of Halicarnassus had before him Demosthenes' text of the same type as the Byzantine Ms. A. But Dionysius seems to be ignorant of the forged documents, interpolated in Demosthenes' *De corona*. On the other hand, a new papyrus of Dem. *de cor.* 217-223, generally agreeing with the Ms. A, exhibits some other interpolated documents, absent from the Byzantine manuscripts. See T. Larsen, *Papyri Graecae Haunienses* I (1942) no. 5.

century B. C. E.<sup>38</sup> A certain Aristecas, quoted by Alexander Polyhistor ca. 80 B. C. E., already draws heavily on the Greek Job.<sup>39</sup> First Maccabees was twice published in Greek: first about 140 B. C. E. (that is the edition used by Josephus), then toward the end of the second century. The translation of Isaiah may be dated between ca. 170–150 B. C. E.<sup>40</sup> In any case, toward the end of the second century B. C. E. the bulk of the Masoretic Bible was already rendered into Greek. For Sirach's grandson, writing some time after 116 B. C. E.,<sup>41</sup> mentions not only the Pentateuch, but also the "Prophecies" and "the rest of the books" as circulating in Greek. But Greek Esther was brought to Alexandria only in 78–77 B. C. E.<sup>42</sup> Philo quotes, (besides the Law), Joshua, Judges, Kings, Job, Chronicles, Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, Jeremiah and the Minor Prophets.

All these versions (perhaps except First Maccabees) were private undertakings. As has been said, according to an unwavering Jewish tradition only the Pentateuch was an authorized version.<sup>43</sup> Esther, for instance, was adapted and rendered into

<sup>38</sup> Cf. *RB*, 1947, 265.

<sup>39</sup> Freudenthal, 139. Freudenthal, 119 argues that the historian Eupolemus (about 160 B. C. E.) already used the "Septuagint" of Joshua, Kings, Chronicles, but the evidence is far from convincing. G. Gerlemann, *Studies in the Septuagint II Chronicles* (Lunds Univ. Arsskrift N. F. Avd. I vol. XLIII, 3, 1946), 13–21 tries to date the version of Chronicles with help of Ptolemaic terms used by the translator. But his evidence is, too, unconvincing. E.g. the version employs the word *διάδοχος* in its general meaning "lieutenant," with no reference to the grades of court officials in Alexandria.

<sup>40</sup> I will deal elsewhere with the problem of Greek Maccabees. It is generally assumed that I Macc. VII, 17 quotes Ps. LXXVIII 3 according to the LXX. The new critical edition of the book (*Septuaginta* IX, 1 ed. W. Kappler, 1936) disposes of this argument. The date of Greek Isaiah is clearly given by LXX Is. IX, 11 (*terminus post quem*) and XXIII, 1 (*terminus ante quem*). Seligmann (above n. 28), p. 90 suggests the same dating.

<sup>41</sup> U. Wilcken, *Archiv für Papyrusforsch.* III (1906) 321.

<sup>42</sup> *JBL*, 1944, 347.

<sup>43</sup> Thackeray, 15–36; J. Herrmann, Fr. Baumgartel. *Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Septuaginta* (1923) tried to prove that Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the Minor Prophets were each rendered into Greek by two collaborators. The hypothesis seems to be unsupported by the evidence, although it is rather probable for Jeremiah. See A. Kaminka, *Studien sur Septuaginta* (1928), 9;

Greek through the initiative and skill of a certain Lysimachus at Jerusalem.

Further, the same Hebrew book may have been adapted into Greek more than once, or a first rendering may have been completely revised by a later editor. Beside I(III) Esdras there is another translation of Ezra-Nehemiah in the Greek Bible. A first (expurgated) version of Samuel and First Kings seems to have been filled in later, and complemented by a version of Second Kings.<sup>44</sup> Hence, the circulation of parallel editions of the same book. We still have two different recensions of Judges,<sup>45</sup> two or three editions of Daniel, two texts of Enoch,<sup>46</sup> two versions of Habakkuk's Psalm (Habb. III),<sup>47</sup> two recensions of Job, three of Tobit, going back to the same original and the same translation; many distinct recensions of Greek Esther, two or three editions of Ecclesiasticus.

While the official version of the Law, as Jerome observed,<sup>48</sup> is faithful in principle (notwithstanding divergences or alterations), the private translators of other Hebrew books were free to deal with the text at pleasure. The translator of Ezekiel seems to have omitted the messianic promise announced in ch. XXXVI, 24-38.<sup>49</sup> As the unedifying story of David's sin with Bath-Sheba (II Sam. XI) was passed over in the synagogue lessons, it was also dropped by the first Greek translator of

J. Ziegler, *Untersuch. zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaiah* (1934) 31; E. H. Case (in the edition of P. 967-8), 63.; R. R. Harwell, *Principal Versions of Baruch* (Yale Dissert. 1915) 63. For Isaiah cf. Seligmann (above n. 28), p. 40.

<sup>44</sup> Thackeray, 16-27; A. T. Olmstead, *AJSL* XXX (1913-4), 1-35; XXXI (1914-5), 169-214.

<sup>45</sup> See above n. 14.

<sup>46</sup> F. C. Burkitt, *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (1914), 53-65; C. Bonner *The Last Chapters of Enoch in Greek* (1937), 22-24.

<sup>47</sup> On Habakkuk's Psalm see M. L. Margolis, in *Old Testament Studies in memory of W. R. Harper* I (1911), 131-42; Thackeray, 47-54, H. Bévenot, *RB.* 1933, 499-525. A second version (or recension) of Job, XXXIII-XXXIV, written on a papyrus ca. 200 C. E. is published in O. Stegmüller, *Berliner Septuaginta Fragmente* (1939) #17.

<sup>48</sup> Hieron, *Quest. Hebr. in Genes. P. L.* XXIII, 957.

<sup>49</sup> See S. E. Johnson, *HThR.* 1943, 135. However, F. V. Filson, *JBL.* 1943, 29 regards the omission of the passage in P. 967 as accidental.



Samuel.<sup>50</sup> Some two hundred verses of the original are missing in Greek Job. The translator shortened the original avoiding repetition of images and other stylistic peculiarities disagreeable to a Greek ear.<sup>51</sup> On the other hand, the Greek Book of Proverbs received many additional sayings.<sup>52</sup> Daniel, Esther, I(III) Esdras in Greek are greatly expanded adaptations of the original works.

Accordingly, in details the translators more often than not allowed themselves the liberty of deviating from the original. For instance, out of 1292 verses of Isaiah less than five per cent are rendered into Greek exactly.<sup>53</sup> The famous saying: *nisi credideritis neque intellegitis* goes back to such a faulty rendering of a passage (Is. VII, 9) by the Septuagint translator.

It is a pity that the earlier, pre-Christian, history of these private translations is hardly traceable. The Prophets and Hagiographa seem to have been little read in Ptolemaic Egypt. Philo's Therapeutes, however, studied not only the Law, but also "the oracles foretold by the Prophets" and "the hymns" (that is the Psalter), "as well as everything which may augment and perfect religious knowledge."<sup>54</sup> But while he quotes the Pentateuch about twelve hundred times, there are no more than fifty passages where he refers to the rest of the Bible. In the Mishna the proportion is said to be only two to one between these two groups of quotations.<sup>55</sup> We may add, that, except by Ben-Sira, the Prophetic Books are hardly mentioned in the Hellenistic Age. Daniel, to be sure, was inspired by Jeremiah. But that was the time of a brief persecution. Under normal conditions, who cared for the menaces against some lost and forgotten kingdom or about some royal transgressor of the Divine Law? It is a remarkable fact that the Greek translators of the

<sup>50</sup> Kaminka (see n. 43) 28.

<sup>51</sup> See G. Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint I. Book of Job* (Lund Univ. Arsskrift N. F. Avd. 1, XLIII, 2, 1946) 22-9.

<sup>52</sup> Thackeray, *JThS* 1912, 46.

<sup>53</sup> R. R. Ottley, *Isaiah II* (1906), p. XV, n. 1.

<sup>54</sup> Philo, *de vita cont.* 25.

<sup>55</sup> F. H. Colson, *J. Th. S.* 1940, 239; W. L. Knox, *ib.* 31; W. L. Knox, *Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity* (1944) 51.

Prophets abstain from interpolating the oracles with references to the new conditions. On the other hand, when the Jewish Sibyl offers a bird's eye view of the Past, the Exile and the Dispersion appear immediately after the Exodus.<sup>56</sup> Only professional historians, Demetrius and then Eupolemus, dealt with the "Middle-Age" of the nation.

#### IV

Eupolemus, writing about 160 B. C. E., is the first Palestinian author we know who uses the Septuagint. Citations from the latter abound in the New Testament. Josephus also follows the Alexandrian version; it is sometimes quoted by the Rabbis.<sup>57</sup> Nevertheless, an appreciation of the recensions used in Palestine is hardly possible. Eupolemus and Josephus paraphrase; the New Testament writers were perfectly capable, as Jerome suggests,<sup>58</sup> of making an independent translation on the spot of a passage they knew by heart, or of quoting the Septuagint from memory.

An examination of the Palestinian citations shows, however,

<sup>56</sup> *Orac. Sibyll.* III, 211-94. Note that in II Macc. (2, 1; 15, 14), Jeremiah appears not as a writer, but as a helper of his people. The newly discovered Hebrew Commentary on Habakkuk (W. H. Brownlee, *BASOR*, 112, 1948) confirms this view. The prophet was read in a time of "wickedness", with reference to the current events.

<sup>57</sup> Lieberman, 48.

<sup>58</sup> Jerome says that the Apostles, particularly Luke, did not follow the Septuagint, in quoting the Old Testament, *sed juxta Hebraicum ponere, nullius sequentes interpretationem, sed sensum Hebraicum cum suo sermone vertentes* (ad Is. XXXVIII, 10. *P. L.* XXIV, 320). Cf. also Theod. Mops. p. 85. This common sense observations disposes of the theory that the N. T. writers quoted a Greek Bible, independent from the "Septuagint." See A. Sperber, *JBL*. LIX. 1940, 193-293 Kahle, 165-7 and, against this theory, Orlinsky (n. 11), 87-90; G. Gerleman, *Zephania* (Diss. theol. Lund, 1942) 75. A. Rahlfs, *Zeitschr. für die Neutest. Wissensch.* XX, 1921, 189 notes that in I Cor. 15, 55 Paul (as well as later Theodotion and Aquila) mistranslates Is. XXV, 8 (*εἰς νίκος*) because they understood the root נָצַח in its Aramaic meaning "be victorious." On such "Aramaisms" in the LXX cf. Gerleman, *l. c.* 79. Cf., also, W. Thomas, in *Record and Revelation* (ed. H. W. Robinson, 1939), 396-8.

that the rolls of the Greek Bible circulating in the Holy Land often disagreed with the standard text received in Egypt.<sup>59</sup> It has been argued from this that there existed Greek versions of the Bible independent of the Alexandrian translation. The candid scholar of to-day fails to take into account the perversity of ancient revisers, who had no scruples about improving the text they had before them. They were particularly prone, as Origen stressed,<sup>60</sup> to amend the proper names in a manuscript at their own sweet will. In fact, the Palestinian variants simply exemplify the tendency well known in the transmission of classics to the areal spreading of peculiar readings. First and above all, a Palestinian (Jewish) copyist, who knew the Hebrew Bible, was naturally prone to amend the Greek text in agreement with the original. The efforts of successive revisers of a translation to bring it into conformity with the current text of the original may now be studied in De Bruyne's model edition of the Latin versions of the Maccabees.<sup>61</sup> The first translation, made before 200 C. E., was revised again and again on the basis of Greek manuscripts. For instance, at I Macc. 3, 34 the original Latin translation has preserved the Hellenistic military term *σημεῖα* by the rendering *signa*. A reviser changed that to *dimidium* in accordance with the current Greek text (*τὰς ἡμίσεις*).

That may teach us something about the similar activity of Palestinian revisers of the Septuagint. For instance, a reviser tried to improve upon the Greek names of the precious stones in Ex. XXVIII, 17–20. A midrashic source gives eight names

<sup>59</sup> On Josephus' quotations cf. A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien* III (1911), 290; H. St. J. Thackeray, *Josephus, the Man and the Historian* (1929) 80–90; Gerleman (see n. 39), 9; Kahle, 151–6. It is methodically important to note that a Greek version of the Samaritan Pentateuch although independent from Origen, often agrees with his renderings, because both translators endeavoured to render the original as exactly as possible. See P. Glee and A. Rahlfs, *MSU* I (1913) 59. Cf. also, G. Ricciotti, *Flavio Giuseppe* I (1937), 110–36.

<sup>60</sup> Orig. *ad* Jo. 1, 29.

<sup>61</sup> D. de Bruyne, B. Sodar, *Les anciennes traductions latines des Machabées* (1932). Cf. my review, *Theolog. Literaturzeitung* 1933, 340. R. Weber, *Les anciennes versions latines du deuxième livre des Paralipomènes* (Collectanea Biblica Latina VIII. 1945) was not accessible to the present writer.



out of twelve as in the Septuagint.<sup>62</sup> Among four discrepant identifications one ("hyacinth") penetrated into the manuscript tradition of the Septuagint and re-appears in the Codex d(44) as well as in the Armenian translation. Again, the same identification is given in the Apocalypse (XXI, 20), another Palestinian work.

The problem is further complicated by the fact that there was no standard Hebrew text. In the first century B. C. E. or C. E. Hebrew manuscripts of a Biblical book may often have disagreed and may often have differed from the Masoretic recension, established (as to the punctuation) many centuries later, in the Arabic period.<sup>62</sup> It is well known that the Septuagint, when in disagreement with the Masoretes, often agrees with the masoretic marginal variants (*Qere*) or with various readings of some Hebrew manuscripts or with the Book of Jubilees, or with the Samaritan text of the Torah, that is with a popular revision of the text of the Law.<sup>63</sup> The Hebrew Nash Papyrus, now dated around 100 B. C. E. exhibits a clause in Dt. VI, 4 which has been dropped by the Masoretes, but is preserved in the Septuagint. The sequence of commandments in the Decalogue, as found in P. Nash (adultery, murder, stealing), reappears in Philo, some New Testament quotations (e. g. Lc. 19, 20) and in some minuscules of Greek Exodus, while Josephus, Mt. 19, 18, and the majority of the LXX-Mss. follow the

<sup>62</sup> Lieberman, 48.

<sup>63</sup> On the Masoretic work cf. R. Gordis, *The Biblical Text in the Making* (1937), 60 and 71 (with H. Orlinsky's critics in *JOAS* 1940, 391), Kahle, 36-85; J. Coppens, *Bi*, 1944, 9-49. It is noteworthy that in Gen. XVIII, 21 the LXX agrees with the Hebrew "Scroll of Severus" (quoted in the Talmud) in referring the word "cry" to the habitants of Sodom. Cf. Ch. D. Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible* (1897) 412. On agreement in Dt. between the LXX and various readings in late Hebrew Mss. cf. J. Hempel, *ZAW* LII, 1934, 268. The LXX and Jubilees: R. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees* (1902) pp. XXXIII-IX. For the Samaritan Torah see now Kahle, 144-9. M. L. Margolis, *JQR*, N. S. III (1912-3), 130 notes that the specific Samaritan reading "Garizim" in Dt. XXVII, 4, entered the Old Latin versions. See, also, F. Zimmerman, *JQR* XXXIV, 1943/4, 459-74; A. Vaccari, *Scriptura Samaritana Fenicia-Samaritana nelle Biblia Ebraica*, *Bi* XIX, 1938, 188-201; C. Coppens, *La critique du texte hebreu de l'A. T.* *Bi* XXV, 1944, 9-49.

Masoretic order.<sup>64</sup> In other cases, the version may have been based on an interpretation which current at the time of the translator, was, then, discarded by the rabbinical authorities.<sup>65</sup> For instance, Jer. XXXII, 12 it is said that the witnesses "wrote into" the deed of the purchase (sc. their names). The Septuagint (Jer. XXXIX, 12) agrees with this reading and interpretation of the Masoretes which assumes that in Jeremiah's time the witnesses signed the documents as they did in Aramaic generally.<sup>66</sup> But a different vocalization of the verb, preserved in some Hebrew Mss. and confirmed by Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotus, the Targum and Jerome, shows that in II-V centuries C. E., at least, it was thought, that the names of the witnesses were written (by the scribe) into the document of Jeremiah, in agreement with the cuneiform practice.

Unfortunately, we are still in want of a real historical investigation of the transmission of the Hebrew text, I mean, one conducted with due regard to Hellenistic techniques of book-making. Richard Simon already noted the influence of Greek methods on the Jewish editors of the Bible. To state it briefly: in Oriental philology, the principle for establishing a text was fidelity to the transmitted readings. Hence, the many parallel accounts and duplicates in Oriental texts.<sup>67</sup> The Greek critics chose among various readings. We are told that the Temple of Jerusalem had three standard exemplars of the Scripture with

<sup>64</sup> See now W. F. Albright, *JBL* 1937, 172. The text of Dt. IV, 31 quoted in a Samaritan inscription again disagrees with the Samaritan manuscript tradition. See W. R. Taylor, *JPOS* X, 1930, 18; W. R. Taylor, *BASOR*, 82 (1941). On P. Nash cf. E. Segal, *Leshonenu* XV, 1947.

<sup>65</sup> For instance the rendering ἄγγελοι τοῦ Θεοῦ in Gen. VI, 2 (in Alex. and 75) agrees with the earlier Jewish interpretation of the expression *bene elohim*, which was later condemned and discarded. Cf. L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* V (1925), 154-6. Kahle, 123 quotes an earlier Targum where Ex. XXII, 4-5 is understood at variance with the rabbinical explanation and the LXX. The Septuagint reading of Gen. 26,32 ("found no water") also in Test. Zebul. 2,7-8; Jub. 24,25 and in rabbinic sources: L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, V, 279 n. 63. Some LXX readings in Isaiah are supported by the new Hebrew scroll. M. Burrows, *BASOR*, 111 (1948) 20.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. L. Blau, in *Judaica, Festschrift H. Cohen* (1912) 220.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (1940) 45.

which new copies were collated, and that in the case of a divergence between the models the majority reading was entered into the new scroll.<sup>68</sup> That is substantially the method of Alexandrine philology — and of Lachmann.

## V

But as soon as the Palestinian Jews accepted the rules of Alexandrine philology with regard to the Hebrew text of the Bible and the latter became fixed, the discrepancy between it and the Septuagint appeared flagrant. Accordingly, round about 125 C. E., perhaps in 128,<sup>69</sup> Aquila, a proselyte to Judaism, rendered into Greek this received Hebrew text, which, so far as the consonants went, was roughly identical with the later Masoretic recension.<sup>70</sup> It is natural that in the presence of a stabilized, "true" text of the Revelation, Aquila felt obliged to render it literally, word for word. Quite naturally, the new translation displaced the less accurate Septuagint in the affection of Greek-speaking Jews, although the Alexandrian version continued to be read in many synagogues as late as during the reign of Justinian (527–565).<sup>71</sup> The Church, on the contrary, held on to the Septuagint, which is quoted in the New Testament. About the same time as the Septuagint was inherited by the Christians, say about 130 C. E., the papyrus codex became the standard form for the sacred books of the Church.

The Christian scribes, quite naturally, began to adapt the old text to the new needs. To begin with, they amended the orthography of the originals. That was due to the influence of grammarians which began to be felt about the middle of the second

<sup>68</sup> See R. Simon, *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament*, I ch. 24; Blau, 97 and *La letteratura moderna sul libro* (Offprint from *Rivista Israelitica* V–VII), 51 and 58. Cf. A. Kaminka, in *Encycl. Judaica* IV, 622. I was unable to see O. Procksch's paper in *Festschrift E. Kuhnert*.

<sup>69</sup> Epiph. *de mens. et pond.* 14 (quoted Swete, 31) gives the 12th year of Hadrian (128–9 C. E.) as the date when Aquila became "known."

<sup>70</sup> J. Reider, *Prolegomena to . . . Aquila* (1915) 84. Cf. A. Rahlfs, *MSU* I, 338, who points that the same is true for Symmachus and Theodotion.

<sup>71</sup> That follows from Justinian's Novella 146. Cf. J. Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain* I (1914), 372; Kahle, 24 and 33.



century C. E., and tended to stabilize the spelling. Ignoring this trend, some modern scholars erected imposing theories based on such variations as between *μηδεῖς* and *μηθείς* in our uncial codices. We are, for instance, invited to believe that the Law in Greek was originally written in ten rolls, each book of the Torah being mechanically divided into two nearly equal portions, and each portion transcribed by a different scribe and from a different autograph.<sup>72</sup> But the Biblical papyri of the second century C. E. exhibit desultory changes from *οὐδεῖς* to *οὔθείς* and vice versa.<sup>73</sup> It is easy to observe that the more recent spellings (*οὐδεῖς*, *ἐναντίον*, *ὅς ἐάν*) generally prevail in the first portion of each book of the Pentateuch, while in the second parts of each the Hellenistic orthography is more common (*οὔθείς*, *ἐναντι*, *ὅς ἄν*).<sup>74</sup> That simply means that when Christian revisers corrected the spelling, they became careless, as we do, about in the middle of their task.<sup>75</sup>

Another, and much more important, change, concerned the Divine Name. In our Christian manuscripts of the Septuagint, the Tetragrammaton is usually rendered by *Κύριος*. So in the Pentateuch. Elsewhere, as in Ezekiel, the rendering oscillates between *Κύριος*, *Κύριος Θεός*, etc. Stressing these variations, a recent writer, in a bulky work of over 1,600 pages argued that the synagogue reading *Adonai* for the Tetragrammaton is a late invention while the Greek *Kyrios* was to be regarded as the cause of this substitution.<sup>76</sup> Now, Origen attests (and Jerome confirms),

<sup>72</sup> That is the theory of Herrman and Baumgartel (see n. 43), 70.

<sup>73</sup> For instance: in Ex. XXXIX, 9: *οὐδεῖς*, (Alex.) *οὔθείς* (P. 961). Ex. XXXIX, 23: *οὔθείς* (Alex.) *οὐδεῖς* (P. 961).

<sup>74</sup> H. St. J. Thackeray, *Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek* (1909) 66.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. e. g. W. Croenert, *Memoria Graeca Herculanensis* (1903) 21; L. W. Hunter, *Aeneas on Siegeskraft* (1927) p. XX; Isocrates, ed. G. Drerup (1906), p. LXX, etc. The scribe D of Cod. Sinaiticus spells *κρίνειν* 27 times and *κρῖνειν* 7 times. See H. J. Milne, T. C. Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus* (1938) 51. In Propertius Codex Napolitanus, one scribes writes *historia*, the other *hystoria*. See Th. Birt, *Propertii . . . Codex . . . Napolitanus* (1911) p. VII and XVIII. In Polybius *οὔθείς* is rather rare in the first seven books, then the spelling occurs after and it predominates in the last books. See F. Kaelker, *De elocutione Polybiana* (1880) 230.

<sup>76</sup> W. W. Baudissin, *Kyrios I-IV* (1929). See against this theory the excellent paper of L. Cerfau, *Rev. des sciences phil. et relig.* 1931, 27-51; 417-452.

that "in more exact copies" of the Septuagint, the Divine Name was "transcribed in Hebrew characters" of the oldest shape (that is not in the square letters).<sup>77</sup> For the sake of modern theories, this statement was disregarded. But it is rather hazardous to contradict a testimony of Origen. In a recently discovered (still unpublished) Jewish roll of the Greek Deuteronomy, the Tetragrammaton is transcribed in the (so called) Aramaicursive amidst the Greek text.<sup>78</sup> Later, Aquila (and probably Symmachus in his recension of the Septuagint) adopted the same mode of representation of the Divine Name.<sup>79</sup>

Secondly, since the fulfillment of the prophecies was a main proof of the new faith, there was an inevitable tendency to interpolate the text. The addition in Ps. XCV (XCVI), 10: the Lord reigns "from the Cross," quoted as the genuine text by Justin, still appears in some branches of the manuscript tradition.<sup>80</sup> In Is. III, 10 many manuscripts used by the Church fathers, from Justin to Clement of Alexandria, exhibited the Christian alteration: "let us remove (LXX: bind) the Just;" while at the same time Melito of Sardis in his copy of Isaiah read the unadulterated text of the passage.<sup>81</sup> On the other hand, Melito quotes Dt. XXVIII, 66 according to a Christian alteration. No wonder that the Church Fathers complained about the falsification of God's words by the "heretics."<sup>82</sup>

<sup>77</sup> Orig. in Ps. II, 2 (*P. G.* XII, 1104); Hieron. Ep. 25 (*P. L.* XXVIII, 594). Cf. now Theod. Mops. p. 134. Cf., G. Mercati, *Bi* XXII, 1941, 339-354, and 1947, 20. On Jerome's Hebrew Mss. cf. E. F. Sutcliffe, *Bi*. 1948, 195.

<sup>78</sup> W. G. Waddel, *JThS* 1944, 160.

<sup>79</sup> Baudissin o. c. II, 7. Cf. *P. Oxy* IV, 656 and VII, 1107.

<sup>80</sup> The interpolation is preserved in the "Upper-Egyptian" and the "occidental" groups of Mss. See A. Rahlfs, *Psalmi* (1931) 30.

<sup>81</sup> C. Bonner, *The Homily on the Passion by Melito* (1940) 37. The two renderings seem to be merely different interpretations of the same Hebrew word אָסַר (for Masoretic אָסַר) according to an oral suggestion of H. L. Ginsberg. On Christian variants in Isaiah cf. Seligmann (above n. 40), p. 25-31.

<sup>82</sup> A. Bludau, *Die Schriftfälschungen der Häretiker* (1925). Cf. Orig. ad Jo XXXII, 32 (Jo XIII, 33) on the supposed interpolation of Jesus' word Lc. 23, 43 by copyists.

Other revisers, Jewish as well as Christian, tried to improve upon the current text for purposes of harmonization. For instance, Is. XLVIII, 21 refers to Moses striking the rock as in Ex. XVII, 16. A clause from the last passage intruded into Isaiah's reference in all our manuscripts. It often happens that the Greek version of Kings is completed according to the parallel passage of Chronicles and vice versa.<sup>83</sup> In P. 967-8 (first half of the III d. c. C. E.), chapters V-VI of Daniel, that is the end of Belsazzar and the coming of Darius are transposed to their chronological place after ch. VIII. It is unclear why in the same codex ch. XXXVII of Ezekiel follows ch. XXXIX while in another recension ch. XL joins ch. XXXVII.

On the other hand, the reverence due to God's utterances obliged a conscientious scribe to improve his text by collation with other copies. The duplicate readings in P. 962 of Genesis (second century C. E.) shows interblending of different text families.<sup>84</sup> In Codex W we can see the successive revisers at work: conflation, then deletion of variants, glossing of the exemplar on the basis of another manuscript. Such collations often depended, directly or indirectly on Jewish scrolls: many corrections in later manuscripts are already attested by Philo.<sup>85</sup>

It is natural that, trying to render God's revelation faithfully, some Christian revisers endeavoured to bring the Septuagint into a closer agreement with the Hebrew. This tendency is already apparent in P. 962 of Genesis, of the second century. Some time later, P. 967-8 exhibits forty-three variants in Ezekiel which are more accurate translations from the Hebrew. For instance, in Ez. XXXVI, 8 this papyrus alone, among all the Greek manuscripts, offers the correct translation of a Hebrew word (ἐγγί-

<sup>83</sup> Cf. Gerlemann (above n. 39), 31-33. A similar interpolation in LXX Is. XLIV, 16 appears in P. 965. In another papyrus, Ex. XXXI, 12-17 is added after Ex. XXIII, 10-13, that is two texts referring to the Sabbath observance are put together. See Stegmüller (above n. 47), #4. Kahle, 144-5 notes analogies in Samaritan Mss.

<sup>84</sup> A. Allgeier, *Die Chester-Beatty Papyri zum Pentateuch* (1938) 29.

<sup>85</sup> Allgeier, *ib.* 42. Cf. *Duodecim Prophetæ*, ed. J. Ziegler (1943) 33 and 84.



ζουσι; the common reading: ἐλπίζουσι). Attested also by the Old Latin version, this improvement was due probably to a Jewish revision, perhaps to the use of Aquila's translation. The latter being a literally one must have been a boon to the revisers. It is noteworthy that this process of assimilation with the Hebrew purged from the Greek Pentateuch most of the thirteen disagreements between the Seventy and the Torah recorded in Talmudic tradition.<sup>86</sup>

The Christian codices of the Greek Bible, in the second and third centuries, thus, exhibited two contrary trends: arbitrary alterations and, on the other hand, accommodations with the better manuscripts and with the *Hebraica veritas*. The result was that substantially the Septuagint text remained sound since the eccentric tendencies were checked by the simultaneous process of contamination. The textual history of Ecclesiasticus may illustrate this force of contamination.<sup>87</sup> When a roll of the Greek Sirach was transcribed on the pages of a Christian codex, let say about 100 C. E., a pair of leaves became transposed by accident. Since all our Greek manuscripts of Ecclesiasticus exhibit this displacement, our whole Greek tradition derives from the same archetype. On the other hand, since the moral lessons offered by Sirach pleased the reader, in another strain of Christian tradition, the book lost the personal prologue as well as the Praise of the Fathers (ch. XLIV-L) but became enriched by new maxims. This shortened and interpolated book, now attributed to Solomon himself, was translated into Latin, in Africa, about 150-200 C. E. Being independent of the archetype of our Greek codices, this Latin version (and likewise the Syriac and Armenian translations and the Hebrew Sirach from the Cairo Genizah) preserves the true order of the chapters. Thus,

<sup>86</sup> The changes remained in Gen. II, 2; Ex. IV. 20; XII, 40; Num. XVI, 15. Cf. above n. 29.

<sup>87</sup> The following paragraph resumes D. de Bruyne's papers in *Revue Bénédictine*, 1928, 5-48 and *ZAW* 1929, 257. As to Hebrew Sirach see C. C. Torrey's paper in this volume. A new fragment has shown that the Cairo text also preserves the right order of chapters of Ecclesiasticus. See J. Marcus, *JQR*, 1937, 224. Cf. M. H. Segal, *JQR* XXV, 1934, 91-150.

we have, it may seem, two completely independent currents of tradition. In fact, both currents almost immediately began to mix. Revisers completed the Latin version according to the standard Greek text, while amplifications of the interpolated recension penetrated into some Greek manuscripts and the Syriac translation.

## VI

The postulate of modern students of the Septuagint is that there was about 200 C. E. a standard text of the Greek version from which the three recensions mentioned by Jerome and our great uncials derive. In fact, about 200 C. E. the period of textual "disorder" was at its height. Unrevised or arbitrarily revised manuscripts of the Septuagint circulated. Clement of Alexandria, the head of the Christian school in this learned city, happens to quote Ez. XVIII, 23 eight times, and each time his text disagrees with his other citations.<sup>88</sup>

Such unstability of the sacred text called for editorial intervention. On the other hand, the stabilization of the Hebrew text and its translation by Aquila facilitated the task by furnishing the future editor of the Septuagint with a standard of correctness. Theodotion of Ephesus, a Gentile converted to the Jewish faith, was the first, so far we know, who undertook the task of revision, probably between 161-169. Since this *Theodotionis editio*,<sup>89</sup> although filling up the lacunae of the current texts (so in Job, Jeremiah) and cutting some expansions not found in the Hebrew (so in Daniel), was a revision of existing manuscripts, it is quite natural that "Theodotionic" readings may appear long before his time, so in the New Testament and Josephus. On the other hand, Theodotion's edition had or acquired rivals. A certain Symmachus published his revision, naturally making

<sup>88</sup> O. Stahelin, *Clemens Alexandrinus und die Septuagint* (1900) 9 and 69. The church father, of course, often adapts citations to his needs. Cf. C. Monderset, *Essai sur Clément d'Alexandrie* (1944) 72. Cf. L. E. Wright, *JBL*, LXVII, 1948, 347-53.

<sup>89</sup> Hieron. ad Daniel. IV, 6 (*P. L.* XXV, 514).

use of Aquila and probably of Theodotion's edition. Other editions remained anonymous.<sup>90</sup>

The Church now found herself in the presence of not only divergent copies of the Septuagint but also of different Jewish revisions of her Old Testament. To help out the Church with the true text, Origen, about 230–245 C. E. gave a new, Christian, revision of the Greek version, based on the manuscripts in ecclesiastic use. As he himself explains, in the case of disagreements among his manuscripts, he made his judgement "according to the other editions," and "from out of the other editions" he added the passages missing in the Septuagint of the church, "in agreement with the Hebrew," while he marked the words and sentences in the Septuagint which were not in the Hebrew.<sup>91</sup> Later, Hesychius, of whom almost nothing is known, and Lucian, who died a martyr's death in Maximin's persecution in 312 C. E.,<sup>92</sup> following Origen's lead, published their own editions of the ecclesiastic Greek Old Testament. Here, we enter into the age of our great uncial codices. By that time, the types of text and "families" of manuscripts that we now know, began to take shape. We thus are able to identify, more or less accurately, Origen's or Lucian's recensions or readings in our manuscripts.

<sup>90</sup> On Theodotion's work cf. Rahlfs, (above n. 58); Kahle, 168–70. On Aquila and Symmachus see now G. Mercati, *Bi* 1944, 1 and 1947, 25. J. Fichtner, *ZAW*, 1939, 155–92 argues that the Greek Bible is quoted in the "Wisdom" according to a recension similar to Aquila and Symmachus. See also O. Eissfeldt, *Die Welt des Orients* I (1947) 92–7. H. J. Schoeps, *Symmachus Studien in Coniectanea Neotestamentica* ed. A. Fridrichsen VI (1942), 65–93 brings arguments for Eusebius' assertion that Symmachus was Ebionite.

<sup>91</sup> Note that Origen (in Mth. XV, 14, p. 388 3d. E. Klostermann) speaks of different "editions" (ἐκδόσεις) and not of different translations, as modern scholars often let him say. On Origen's Hexapla see now Kahle, 160–4 and Mercati's papers quoted n. 90. Cf. H. Orlinsky, The Columnar Order of the Hexapla, *JQR* XXVII, 1946, 137–49; W. E. Staples, The Second Column of Origen's Hexapla, *JAOS*, LIX, 1939, 71–80. E. A. Speiser, The Pronunciation of Hebrew . . . in the Hexapla, *JQR* XXIII, 1933, 256–80; XXIV, 1934, 1–46. On important (and mostly overlooked account of Rufinus (*H. E.* VI, 16, 3–4) cf. J. E. L. Oulton, *JThS*, XXX, 1929, 162. G. Mercati, *Nuove note di Letteratura Biblica e Cristiana antica (Studi e Testi* XCV, 1941).

<sup>92</sup> On Lucian see now G. Bardy, *Recherches sur S. Lucian d'Antioche* (1936), 164–78, and G. Mercati, *Bi*, 1943, 1–17; Kahle, 152.



The Hebrew text being now acknowledged as the original, the Church editors began to purge the ecclesiastic Septuagint of the Christian interpolations. Justin insisted that the reading "bind" in Is. III, 10 was a Jewish falsification. Nevertheless his reading ("remove") disappeared from all known Greek manuscripts of the Septuagint.<sup>93</sup> Since in the New Testament (Rom. III, 10) some passages from other Psalms follow a quotation from Ps. 13, 1-3, the whole group of citations intruded into Christian texts of the Psalm 13. Origen's edition seems to have preserved this interpolation, Lucian removed it.<sup>94</sup> A peculiar reading in Ecclesiasticus (XXXIV, 30), quoted by Cyprian, became so forgotten two centuries later, that Augustine regarded it as new forgery of "heretical" Donatists.<sup>95</sup> Even readings attested in the New Testament, as for instance in Is. LIII, 4, were now banished from the current Septuagint editions.<sup>96</sup> When ca. 300 C. E. a poor man in Egypt copied on a potsherd a passage from Judith (XV, 1-7), his text was that of our great uncial codices.<sup>97</sup>

As in the case of the classics, however, the learned editions of Origen or Lucian did not stop the transmission of variants by some non-conformist scribes. For instance, the singular reading  $\delta \acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\beta\eta\varsigma$  in Dt. XXV, 2 appears in P. 957, a Jewish roll of the second century B. C. E. It re-appears in Codex W, of the fifth century, and, then, in some minuscules. Two singular readings attested in the manuscript h(55) of the eleventh century C. E. now figure in P. Fouad, another Jewish roll of Deuteronomy, written some twelve hundred years before the minuscule h. In

<sup>93</sup> Cf. *Septuaginta* XIV. *Isaias* ed. J. Ziegler (1939) p. 26 and 35; J. Ficht-ZAW LVII, 1939, 180. Origen himself, however, sometimes harmonized the text with the New Testament citations. See L. Lutkemmann, *De prophetarum minorum locis ab Origene laudatis*, Diss. Greifswald, 1911, p. 85.

<sup>94</sup> *Septuaginta* X, *Psalmi*, ed. A. Rahlfs (1930), 30.

<sup>95</sup> August, *Retract.* I (20) 21, 3, quoted Bludau (see n. 82), 61.

<sup>96</sup> Cf. K. J. Euler, *Die Verkündigung vom leidenden Gottesknecht* (1934) 61. Cf. also A. Deissman, *Septuaginta-Papyri* (1905), 65-6.

<sup>97</sup> J. Schwartz, *RB.* 1946, 534. Cf. also A. Vogliano, *Papiri della R. Università di Milano* I, 22: a papyrus of Ex. XXIX, 21-24 (IVth c. C. E.) exhibiting the standard LXX text.

Gen. XXXIII, 18 the Septuagint, according to all manuscripts and versions made from the Greek, read: in Salem, "city of Schechemites." This reading is already attested in Jubilees (30, 1). But the historian Demetrius, writing between 221–205 B. C. E. in his copy of Greek Genesis read: "in another city of the Schechemites" (*εἰς ἑτέραν πόλιν Σικίμων*).<sup>98</sup> The same strange variant suddenly pops up in a medieval Latin text which tells us that Jacob went *in alteram civitatem*. A recently published Latin papyrus of Exodus may illustrate the transmission of variants. Here, a clause is omitted in Ex. VIII, 13. The same form of text is exhibited in the Greek papyrus 905 and in some Byzantine minuscules.<sup>99</sup> So, again as in the case of the classics, the standard editions could not produce uniformity of manuscript tradition.<sup>100</sup> As Jerome says in regard to the manuscripts of the Latin Bible, everyone changed, added or shortened the text in his copy at will.<sup>101</sup> As in the case of the classics, the text became more or less static only when there was an authoritative or official edition: Jerome's Vulgate gradually became the Bible of the Latin West. The Alexandrine edition of Homer from ca. 150 B. C. E. on outrivaled the "eccentric" copies and became the basis of Byzantine manuscripts. Generally speaking, buyers of books naturally preferred the authoritative edition of a classic, so that its text tended to supplant eccentric copies. Later, in Byzantine universities, scholars consulted the best and standard ancient editions when preparing a new one of a Greek classic.<sup>102</sup> That is the reason why, for instance, our Byzantine text of Thucydides is regarded as better than that quoted by Dionysius of Halicarnassus in Augustus' times.

<sup>98</sup> A. T. Olmstead, *AJSL*. 1917–8, 163.

<sup>99</sup> A. Vaccari, *Bi*, 1941, 1. On the Greek Psalter used by Theodorus of Mopsuestia cf. Vaccari *Bi*. 1942, 1–8.

<sup>100</sup> Theod. Mops. quotes Ez. XXII, 11 and XXIII, 1 according to the standard LXX, but has a singular reading in Ez. XXIII, 2. See p. 287 ed. Devresse. He also notes (p. 301) that some Mss. omitted the second part of the Ps. LV, 3–4. On similar variations in Byzantine Mss. of Isaiah cf. Seligmann (above n. 40), p. 9.

<sup>101</sup> Hier. *Praef. in IV Evang.* (P. L. XXIX, 526). Cf. August. *de doct. christ.* II, 11, 6.

<sup>102</sup> Cf. L. Bréhier, *Revue d'histoire et de philos. relig.* XXI. 1941, 34–69.

## VII

Let us go back to the Septuagint. Before the learned editions of Lucian, Origen, Theodotion there was no "pure" or "basic" text of the Alexandrian version, as imagined by modern scholars but a maze of manuscripts exhibiting mixed readings and arbitrary alterations. Jerome, who knew his business of editor, qualifies this "common" (*κοινή*) text as follows: "the old edition corrupted at various times and in various places at the pleasure of the scribes."<sup>103</sup> We may, perhaps, establish some main types of texts current in the Church before Origen, let say for the Psalter, the "Lower Egyptian," the "Upper Egyptian" and the "Occidental" groups.<sup>104</sup> But these types don't go back to the same archetype manuscript, as it is the case with the "families" in medieval transmission, where by comparison of later copies, we may draw inferences as to their lost common ancestor. For behind the complexity of Christian codices there is the plurality of Jewish rolls.

A capital distinction, however, must be drawn. The Penta-teuch was published in an official translation of the Seventy. The copy of Esther, deposited in Alexandria in 78-77 B. C. E., and the autograph of Sirach's grandson are the ultimate sources of Greek Esther and Ecclesiasticus respectively. In these cases, we may have as a goal, which we may hope, *Deo volente*, to attain in some measure, the recovery of the original translation, later disfigured by a mass of arbitrary variants. Here we deal with manuscripts which, at the last, derive from a common ancestor.

But what about private, anonymous, often incomplete, versions of other Jewish books: Enoch or Jeremiah or Kings? Here the text, unprotected by any authority, unstable from the beginning, was freely amended, supplemented and altered by revisers. What is the "authentic" text in the case of such

<sup>103</sup> Hieron. *Ep.* CVI, 2: *κοινή* pro locis et temporibus et pro voluntate scriptorum vetus corrupta editio est. To this "vulgate" text he opposes Origen's edition.

<sup>104</sup> See Rahlfs' edition quoted n. 94.



traditional works, which grow with time? Various answers are possible. The question, however, must be asked before a restoration of the "true" text of a Septuagint book is attempted.

## VIII

This sketch of the history of Septuagint transmission, from the Seventy to Origen to Lucian, unfortunately cannot offer any constructive idea. This paper only points out the limits of our knowledge, or, at least, of my ignorance. *Nemo ergo ex me scire quaerat quod me nescire scio, nisi forte ut nescire discat.*<sup>105</sup>

<sup>105</sup> August. *de civ. Dei* XII, 7.

## ANTICHRESIS IN JEWISH AND ROMAN LAW

By BOAZ COHEN

In an article entitled "A Description of Bills of Exchange, 1559,\* Prof. Marx gave a free translation of the fifteenth chapter of a tract on usury by R. Yehiel Nissim da Pisa. Accordingly I propose to pursue on the occasion of his jubilee a study of Antichresis, a scheme that skirts persistently along the theme of usury.

Antichresis designates a legal institution known to the ancient Assyrians and Babylonians,<sup>1</sup> to the Greeks since the time of Demosthenes,<sup>2</sup> to the Egyptians,<sup>3</sup> to the Romans,<sup>4</sup> to the Jews<sup>5</sup> to the Persians,<sup>5a</sup> and to the Syrians<sup>6</sup> and it has infiltrated into

\* Cf. *Studies in Jewish History and Booklore*, 1944 pp. 167-173. Lecky incidentally was inclined to believe in the theory which ascribed the invention of the letter of exchange to the Jews, cf. his *Rationalism in Europe* II. 272 note 1.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Manigk, *Gläuberbefriedigung Durch Nutzung*, Berlin 1910 p. 78-93, Kohler und Peiser, *Aus dem babylonischen Rechtsleben* I. 15 ff. Rostovtzeff and Welles in *Yale Classical Studies* II. 1931, p. 62 ff. Koschaker, *Über einige Griechische Rechtsurkunden aus den Östlichen Randgebieten des Hellenismus* 1931 p. 94 note 5, San Nicolo, *Beiträge zur Rechtsgeschichte im Bereiche der Keilschriftlichen Rechtsquellen* 1931 p. 247-248, and H. M. Weil, in *Archives d'Histoire du droit Oriental* II. 1938, p. 182 note 1.

<sup>2</sup> Hitzig, *Das Griechische Pfandrecht* 1895 pp. 93, 95, 136.

<sup>3</sup> Taubenschlag, *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt*. pp. 216-220.

<sup>4</sup> Jörs-Kunkel, *Römisches Recht*, 1935 p. 155. Antichresis is not a classical term in Roman Law, cf. Schulz, *Roman Legal Science* p. 295 note 7.

<sup>5</sup> Gulak, *הולדות המשפט בישראל* I. Jerusalem 1939 p. 71-81.

<sup>5a</sup> Cf. A. Pagliaro, *L'anticresi nel diritto sasanidico*, in *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* XV. 1934. pp. 275-315. I am indebted to Prof. Bernard Geiger for this reference.

<sup>6</sup> Manigk, l. c. 66-78.

most systems of modern civil law.<sup>7</sup> Nevertheless, the term *ἀντίχρησις* appears for the first time in a Greco-Egyptian papyrus<sup>8</sup> of the second century C. E. It is employed twice by Marcianus<sup>9</sup> in his book on the Hypothecary Formula, and once by an anonymous authority — probably of the third century — in the Palestinian Talmud.<sup>10</sup> Needless to say that this institution assumed various forms as it appeared among different peoples in the course of time. Essentially, antichresis is an agreement by which the creditor may use the pledge, be it real or personal property,<sup>11</sup> for the amortization of the principal or interest or both. The antichresis occurs also independently of the pledge.<sup>12</sup>

In Tannaitic law, a pledge given as security for a debt, could not be used by the creditor, who was liable for its safekeeping.<sup>13</sup> The general rule laid down in the Mishnah<sup>14</sup> was that the creditor

<sup>7</sup> Cf. H. Lobut, *L'Antichrèse autrefois et aujourd'hui, son évolution historique, son rôle dans la pratique*, Paris 1897, and *Corpus Juris*, New York 1926, vol. 40 pp. 1362–1363.

<sup>8</sup> *Papyri Groninganae*, ed. A. G. Ross, Amsterdam 1933 no. 11. According to Taubenschlag, l. c. p. 216 note 62, the term antichresis occurs only once in the Papyri.

<sup>9</sup> F. Ebrard, *Die Digestenfragmente ad Formulam Hypothecariam* 1917 p. 116, note 73, and Bortolucci, *Index Verborum graecorum quo in Institutionibus et Digestibus occurrunt*, in *Archivio Giuridico*, 76 (1906) p. 361. and Voigt, *Römische Rechtsgeschichte*, II. 1899, p. 680, note 54.

<sup>10</sup> B. M. VI.7. (11a).

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Manigk, *Antichretische Grundstückshaftung in der Festgabe für Güterbock*. 1910.

<sup>12</sup> R. Tam was aware of this too when he wrote *מדקתני המלוה את חבריו לא ידור* (Tosafot B. M. 64b s. v. ולא). בחצירו ולא קתני המלוה על חצירו של חבריו.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. M. Shebuot VI.7 where the pledge is referred to as a deposit (פקדון) R. Meir of Rothenburg decided that a creditor who stipulates that he assumes no responsibility for the pledge, is free entirely from liability, cf. Mordecai, BM. 361.

<sup>14</sup> B. M. VI.7. For the reason given by R. Hai Gaon why the creditor is deemed a paid bailee cf. *המקד והממכר* s' ed. Vienna 1800 f. 96b, cf. also Tosafot B. M. 82b s. v. אימור where it is quoted and Tosafot l. c. 82a s. v. ניטא end. Tosafot (B. M. 80b s. v. דקא) would not entertain the notion that the creditor is a paid bailee in lieu of the satisfaction he has in holding the pledge in his possession which he can seize in case of default. לימא טעמא דבההיא הנאה דחפסי. ודחקה לאשכוחיה טעמא דבמרא. For the Moslem law, cf. Ibn Qasim Al-Ghazzi, *Fath Al-Qarib*, ed. Van den Berg, Leyden, 1894, pp. 332–333.



assumed the responsibilities of a paid bailee<sup>14</sup> (שומר שכר), R. Eliezer was of the opinion that he was no more than a gratuitous bailee since he held the pledge merely as a security.<sup>15</sup> R. Judah, compromised the controversy, by maintaining that, if the object of the loan were money, the creditor became a gratuitous bailee, if it were fruit, then he was considered a paid bailee.<sup>16</sup> R. Akiba, on the other hand, took the view that the pledge became the possession of the creditor, and consequently if it were lost, no matter what its value, the creditor could not sue for his debt. However, even R. Eliezer agreed if a loan of 1000 zuz by deed or written instrument, was secured by a pledge, and the latter were lost, the creditor forfeited his right to recover the loan.<sup>17</sup> In keeping with R. Akiba's opinion are the view of the Palestinian Amora, R. Isaac that the creditor acquires possession of the pledge, מכאן שבעל חוב קונה משכון and the decision of the Babylonian scholar, Samuel, that if a person loaned his fellow a 1000 zuz and received as security the handle of a scythe, that he can not recover the debt if the pledge disappeared.<sup>18</sup>

Similarly in Roman law, the holder of the pledge may not use it. As Gaius says, *Si pignore creditor utatur, furti tenetur*.<sup>19</sup> Papinian implies that a creditor may not use a pledge without the debtor's consent, for we ordinarily assume that it was put

<sup>14</sup> For the liability of the latter, cf. M. Shebuot VIII.1.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. baraita, B. M. 81b, and Rashi ad. loc. דאין אדם נוטל משכנו לנזכירא להיות בטוח במעותיו

<sup>16</sup> B. M. VI.7.

<sup>17</sup> B. M. 81b. As Rashi says דהא משכון ודאי לנזכירא שקל לנכות הימנה דסתם שטר יש בו שעבוד קרקעות. For a similar view in Greek law, cf. Hitzig, l. c. p. 96, and Lipsius, *Das Attische Recht*, p. 705 note 105. According to a ruling of Alexander in the year 225, the debtor was released from his debt if the creditor loses the pledge, only if there was a previous agreement to this effect *Nisi inter contrahentes placuerit, ut amissio pignorum liberet debitorem* (C. 4.24.6) If it were a pledged slave who died then the debt must be repayed. *Servo, qui fuerat pignori obligatus, defuncto debiti permanet integra petitio* (C. 8. 13.25). For the Persian Law on this point, cf. Pagliaro, l. c., p. 286.

<sup>18</sup> B. M. 82a. M. Shebuot VI.7, which discusses the rule where the pledge is lost and the debtor and creditor differ as to its value, is seemingly at variance with the view of R. Akiba.

<sup>19</sup> D. 47.2.55 pr. For a similar rule in Indian law cf. William Jones *Laws of Menu* p. 295-296.

aside as a security for the payment of the obligation to be returned when the latter was returned (*utique si non in usu creditoris id argentum voluntate debitoris fuit, sed propositum propter contractus fidem ac restituendae rei vinculum.*)<sup>20</sup> Ulpian informs us that both malice and negligence may be the subject of an action on a pledge, as in the case of a loan for use. Safe keeping is also included, but force majeure does not come into consideration.<sup>21</sup> *Venit autem in hac actione et dolus et culpa, ut in commodato: venit et custodia, vis maior non venit*, Paulus reports that the same diligence which the careful head of a household is accustomed to exercise in his own affairs, is required of the creditor.<sup>22</sup> *Ea igitur, quae diligens pater familias in suis rebus praestare solet, a creditore exiguntur.* According to the decisions of Emperors Alexander<sup>23</sup> and Philip,<sup>24</sup> the pawnee is a sort of bailee or borrower. Justinian held that the holder of a deposit and a pawnee who used the pawn are guilty of theft.<sup>25</sup>

In English and American law, the bailee may use the pledge, if it will not be the worse for it, but if he does, it is at his own peril and he is answerable for it, as the pawn is in the nature of a deposit.<sup>26</sup>

The earliest reference to the modification of the rule prohibiting the use of a pledge is to be seen in the view of Abba Saul who permitted a man to hire out the pledge of an indigent debtor

<sup>20</sup> D. 33.10.9.2. on this passage cf. Hitzig, *Das Griechische Pfandrecht* p. 96 note 2.

<sup>21</sup> D. 13.7.13.1 cf. also Roby, *Roman Private Law* II. 106. For *dolus*, cf. Pernice, Z. S. S. 17, 1896, pp. 205–208. For *Vis Maior*, cf. the observation of Gaius, *Vis Maior, quam Graeci θεοῦ βίαν appellant* (D. 19.2, 25.6) which reminds one of the term Act of God in English Law, which came to be used in the 16th century, cf. *Corpus Juris* vol. I p. 1172.

<sup>22</sup> D. 13.7.13.1 cf. also Roby, *Roman Private Law* II. 106.

<sup>23</sup> D. 13.7.14.

<sup>24</sup> C. IV.24. 5–6. In English law, too, a pledge is a bailment of personal property, cf. Holmes, *Common Law* p. 176, 244, 249 and Story, *Bailment* §286.

<sup>25</sup> C. IV.24.8.

<sup>26</sup> *Institutes of Justinian* IV.1.6.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, London 1825 vol II. 451, Broom, *Commentaries on the Common Law* p. 889, Parsons, *Law of Contract* II.111, III. 237.

for the amortization of the debt,<sup>27</sup> להיות פוסק עליו והולך מפני, שהוא כמשיב אבידה, but he was not allowed to touch the pawn of an affluent debtor.<sup>28</sup> In the Talmud, the rule was established that the pledge could be hired out, only in cases where the wear and tear were slight, and the profits were considerable.<sup>29</sup> In the Yerushalmi the question is raised: But does not this antichresis involve usury הוא אנטיכריסיס רבית, i. e. does not the hiring out of the pledge lead to the possibility that the pawnee may get more than the value of the loan and delay returning the surplus, which will be usury.<sup>30</sup>

R. Yohanan<sup>31</sup> observed in this connection that a man would willingly under certain circumstances give his fruits as a pledge, and agree to their sale<sup>32</sup> by the creditor in order to liquidate his debt. רוצה אדם ליתן כמה ולמכור פירותיו על ידי משכון. We may here envisage a case of the sale of pledged property by the creditor, similar to that referred to by Tryphoninus<sup>33</sup> "where the price

<sup>27</sup> M. B. M. VI.7. According to Maimonides the creditor could hire out the pledge without the consent of the debtor as it was for his benefit (מלוה ולוה) III.8).

<sup>28</sup> T. B. M. VII.19.

<sup>29</sup> B. M. 82b.

<sup>30</sup> B. M. VI.5. We believe that the interrogation הוא אנטיכריסיס רבית should be transposed after Samuel's statement, and that it is a query upon Abba Saul's view, cf. the remark of Paulus. If a creditor was slow in returning the surplus which he held on deposit, then he should be constrained to pay interest to the debtor because of the delay. *Si autem tardius superfluum restituat creditor id quod apud eum depositum est, ex mora etiam usuras debitori hoc nomine praestare cogendus est* (D. 13.7.7), cf. on this passage. Manigk, *Gläuberbefriedigung durch Nutzung* p. 63 note 2, cf. also for "*superfluum*", D. 36.4.5.21.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Yer. I. c. where a similar view is given by R. Abbahu in the name of R. Jose b. Hanina.

<sup>32</sup> It is understood that a pledge can be sold only if the owner agrees. This is also the view of the Roman jurists, cf. the statement of Javolenus in D. 47.2.74.

<sup>33</sup> D. 20. 5. 12. 1. cf. also the decision of Diocletian in the year 294. If nothing was agreed upon and the pledges were sold by the creditor in accordance with the terms of the contract, for a larger sum than was due to him, even though he may have purchased land with the proceeds, an action *in rem* will not lie for the surplus, but one *in personem* must be brought, that is to



paid under such circumstances would certainly benefit the debtor, more than it would profit the creditor" *certa ex occasione eius redactum id pretium aequius proficeret debitori quam creditoris lucro crederet.*"

The Amoraim also find in M. B. M. VI.7 an allusion to the rule that a pledge may be used by the creditor by special agreement in order to liquidate his debt.<sup>34</sup>

So far we have dealt with chattels, but the various forms of antichresis usually involved the use of real estate or slaves. It was most common for the creditor either to lease out land or a house given to him as security for a debt, or to live on the premises until the debt and/or the interest had been paid. This seems to be clearly stated by Marcianus.<sup>35</sup> *Si ἀντίχρησις facta sit et in fundum aut in aedes aliquis inducatur, eo usque retinet possessionem pignoris loco, donec illi pecunia solvatur, cum in usuras fructus percipiat aut locando aut ipse percipiendo habitandoque: itaque si amiserit possessionem, solet in factum<sup>36</sup> actione uti.* We are informed by Paulus that in case where a loan was made without interest, the creditor may retain for himself the profits accruing from the encumbered property, to the amount of the legal rate of interest.<sup>37</sup> *Cum debitor gratuita pecunia utatur, potest creditor de fructibus rei sibi pigneratae ad modum legitimum usuras retinere.*

say, an action on the pledge. *Secundum placiti fidem, si nihil convenit specialiter, pignoribus a creditore maiore quam ei debebatur pretio distractis, licet ex eo fundus comparatus sit, non super hoc in rem, sed in personam, id est pigneraticia de superfluo competit actio.* (C. 8.28.20).

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Rashi to B. M. 82b, s. v. במלוח says פוחח עליו להיוח פוחח מן החוב והולך. Whether the creditor needs the permission of the debtor to use the debt, was a matter of controversy among the medieval legal commentators, cf. Caro and Sirkes to Tur, *Hoshen Mishpat*, 72.1.

<sup>35</sup> D. 20.1.11.1. For this passage, cf. Manigk, p. 48–49. and Petropoulos, *Ἱστορία καὶ εἰσαγγήσεις τοῦ Ῥωμαικοῦ δικαίου*, p. 682 note 35.

<sup>36</sup> For the formula "*in factum*", cf. de Visscher, *Études de Droit Romain* 1931 p. 361 et. seq.

<sup>37</sup> D. 20.2.8. On this passage, cf. Dernburg, *System des Römischen Rechts*. Berlin 1911, vol. I. p. 505 note 6, and Weiss, *Pfandrechtliche Untersuchungen* I.39 note 6.

There are many references in the papyri where the creditor lived in the house of the debtor gratis instead of collecting interest<sup>38</sup> (μίσθωσις ἀντί τόκω). However, in Jewish law where interest is strictly forbidden, this arrangement was naturally illegal. Thus we read in the Mishnah:<sup>39</sup> A creditor may not dwell in the debtor's courtyard gratis, or rent it out from him at a reduced rate, for this is tantamount to usury, המלוה אה חבירו לא ידור בחצרו חנם ולא ישכור ממנו בפתות מפני שהוא רבית. R. Nahman<sup>40</sup> permitted a species of tacit antichresis for he allowed the creditor to live in the creditor's courtyard without charge, if there were no stipulation to that effect at the time of the loan or afterwards.

In the Yerushalmi<sup>41</sup> we have a case bearing on this theme. A certain person lent his fellow some money whereupon he allowed the creditor to dwell in his house. When the creditor was importuned to pay the rent, he retorted, pay me the money you owe me. When the issue came before R. Bo bar Minah<sup>42</sup> for adjudication he said, Deduct the amount of rent from the debt וקים ליה מאי דהוה חמי משרי.<sup>43</sup>

According to a Post-Talmudic view, if the debtor said to the creditor at the time when the latter requested the payment of the loan, Dwell in my courtyard until I repay you, such an arrangement is indirect usury (אבק רבית) since the agreement was not made at the time of the loan for Scripture says "Thou shalt not give him interest".<sup>44</sup>

<sup>38</sup> Manigk p. 26, Taubenschlag, p. 218 note 75.

<sup>39</sup> M. B. M. V.2.

<sup>40</sup> B. M. 64b. According to the second version of R. Nahman's statement as interpreted in the Talmud ומיד הלויני אבל הלוהו לא מאי טעמא כיון דמעיקרא לא אדעתא דהכי אחפיה ליה לן בה.

<sup>41</sup> B. M. V. 1.

<sup>42</sup> R. Bo b. Mina, is the correct reading and not R. Bo b. Bizna which is found in the medieval commentators, cf. Lieberman של קשרין p. 84, note 4.

<sup>43</sup> For this phrase there are variant readings among the early authorities which are quoted by Daiches in his commentary ad. loc.

<sup>44</sup> Maimonides מלוה ולוה VI.3. The later legal authorities were strongly opposed to this liberal interpretation of the law. In Kid. 6b דארווח לה זימנא סב is considered as הערמת רבית.

The Talmud records a single instance of the use of the slave of a debtor by the creditor. Thus R. Joseph B. Hama seized the slaves of his debtor and had them work for him gratis during the period of the loan. He tried to justify his conduct on two different legal grounds. However he was convinced by the arguments of his son Raba that such activity had the appearance of usury (מיחוי כרבית) and he recanted.<sup>45</sup>

Raba's view is paralleled by Roman precedents. Thus Emperor Alexander in the year 222 ordered that the labor of a slave or the rent of a house held as a pledge, diminishes the amount of the debt, *Quod ex operis ancillae vel ex pensionibus domus, quam pignori detineri dicis, perceptum est, debiti quantitatem relevabit*.<sup>46</sup> A similar ruling is found in a decree of Diocletian of the year 294. If a creditor was pleased to accept the services of a certain slave as compensation for his debt, he was obliged to return the slave, after the agreement had been fulfilled. *Si operas certi servi pecunia sumpta creditorem sibi in debitum compensare placuit, his secundum conventionis fidem praestitis de mancipio restituendo pacti tenor servari debet*.<sup>47</sup>

In the Syrian Roman Law Book, Lex. 99 there is the following provision, which reads as follows: Similarly if a man gives his fellow a slave woman as a pledge,<sup>48</sup> and gives her as his possession so that she may work for him, then her services are in lieu of the interest on the money borrowed by her master הכנא אף

<sup>45</sup> B. M. 64b, B. K. 97a. For the use of slaves as pledges in Persian Law, cf. Pagliaro, l. c., p. 288.

<sup>46</sup> C. 4.24.2, for the papyri, cf. Weiss, *Pfandrechtliche Untersuchungen* p. 42 note 1.

<sup>47</sup> C. 8.42.20.

<sup>48</sup> For the use of pledged slaves as antichresis in Greek law, cf. Hitzig, l. c. p. 95–96. The case of a Jewish girl who was left as a pledge with a Gentile in Ashkelon to secure a debt (הורנה) (M. Eduyot, 8.2) probably reflects Hellenistic Law. For the term הורנה Note that in Arabic رهن is the regular term for pledge, e. g. Rashid Al Bakri, the 13th century writer on Fikh in his *Kitab Lubab al-Lubab*, Tunis 1346, pp. 168–173, has a chapter on רהן. Similarly in Samuel ben Hofni's *Sefer Ha-Mitsvot* there is a chapter on רהן cf. Boaz Cohen, *JQR*, NS, 25, 1935, p. 527.



אן נסים גברא לחברא משכנא<sup>49</sup> אמתא ונתל לה נומא<sup>50</sup> דאפלה עמה פולחנה<sup>51</sup> נהוא חלף רביתא דכספא דיוף מרה.

While the Tannaim were opposed to an antichresis in the form of *ἐνοικίσις* of apartments in lieu of interest, they tolerated a transaction which gave to one of the parties a kind of profit that resembled usury. Thus the Mishnah<sup>52</sup> laid down the rule: If a man sold a house in a walled city (cf. Lev. 25.29) he may redeem it at once, or at any time during the period of twelve months. This is a species of usury and yet it is not usury זה הרי זה כמין רבית ואינה רבית. It is a sort of interest because the purchaser receives all his money without deducting for the time he resided in the house, if the vendor redeems it. On the other hand, it is not usury, for the transaction was a *bona fide* purchase and not a loan, nor was it certain that the vendor would redeem it. According to another Tannaitic view, this was an instance of usury pure and simple, but was expressly permitted by the Law,<sup>53</sup> הרי זה רבית גמורה אלא שהתורה התירה.

The majority of the Tannaim were opposed to any antichresis which gave the usufruct of the land pledged security to the creditor, as this meant outright usury. Neither did the rabbis permit a debtor who mortgaged his home or field to stipulate

<sup>49</sup> Maškenu is already used in Neo-Babylonian Law, cf. Koschaker, *Über einige Griechische Urkunden* p. 63 note 1, and Cuq, *Études sur le Droit Babylonien* p. 312.

<sup>50</sup> נומא = *νομή*, which equals the Roman *possessio*, occurs in the papyri, cf. Taubenschlag l. c. p. 174 note 5, and Hunt, *Studi Riccobono* I. 523. The term *νομή* is found in the phrase כיון שעשה לו נכרי נימוסו (Git. 43b) as was noticed by Büchler. *REJ.* 48 (1904) 135–136.

<sup>51</sup> For *Palahu* as a technical term in Assyrian Babylonian documents dealing with pledges, cf. Koschaker, *Über einige Griechische Urkunden*. p. 12, 78–79. and San Nicolo, *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, 1931, p. 1016.

<sup>52</sup> Arakin X.3.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Baraita, Arakin 31a. The view that the case of the sale of a home in a walled city could involve direct usury is seemingly in conflict with the generally accepted amoraic conception that usury prohibited by scripture was limited merely to moneylending proper מלוה and not מכר, cf. B. M. 60b, 61b. According to a view attributed to R. Tam the passage is to be interpreted as רבית גמורה cf. Tosafot BM. 64b. s. v. ולא and Arakin 31a s. v. והתניא.

with the creditor that it may be resold only to the former at a specified sum which would yield a profit to the creditor. If the field were to be resold at its actual value, the agreement was valid<sup>54</sup> משכן לו בית משכן לו שדה ואמר לו כשתרצה למכרם לא תמכרם אלא לי בדמים הללו אסור בשווים מותר.

R. Judah took a more advanced view with regard to an anti-chretic loan on land, for he maintained that a creditor may enjoy the usufruct of a mortgaged field if a conditional conveyance of property is made that it become absolute unless it is redeemed before the expiration of three years<sup>55</sup> הרי שהיה נושה בחבירו מנה ועשה לו שדהו מכר . . . ר' יהודה אמר אף בזמן שהלוקח אוכל פירות מותר. Since this antichresis was not for the purpose of amortizing the principal, the profits were nothing less than interest.

The view of R. Judah presupposes the ruling in the Mishnah<sup>56</sup> which permits an agreement whereby a pledge becomes the property of the creditor if the debtor did not redeem it at maturity, for example at the expiration of three years<sup>57</sup> הלוהו על שדהו ואמר לו אם אי אתה נותן לי מכאן ועד שלש שנים הרי היא שלי הרי היא שלו. This Mishnaic law is identical with the *Lex Commissoria*<sup>58</sup> which was abolished by Constantine in 326 because of its "*asperitas*" (Code 8.34.3) and was re-introduced in much modified form by Justinian (Code 8.33.3). However, R. Judah went one step further, and maintained that if this agreement for foreclosure was made

<sup>54</sup> B. M. 65b. Tosafot (l. c. s. v. לכשיהיו) distinguish between a sale with a contract for repurchase, and a classical mortgage (משכנתא בלא נכייתא). With respect to the latter only, the creditor or his survivors may redeem the property. This is also the rule in English law.

<sup>55</sup> B. M. 63a and parallels.

<sup>56</sup> M. B. M. V.3.

<sup>57</sup> For the rule concerning the redemption of a pledge within 3 years, cf. D. 18.1.81 and on this passage, cf. Rabel, ZSS. 1907 p. 363.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. J. C. Naber, *De Lege Commissoria* in Mnemosyne 32, 1904 p. 81 et seq. Arangio-Ruiz, *Istituzioni di Diritto Romano*, 1947 p. 265, and Wieacker, *Lex Commissoria*, Freiburg, 1932. Cf. also D. 18.3.5 and Berger, *Die Strafklauseln in den Papyrusurkunden* p. 159.

in the form of a *venditio condicionalis*<sup>59</sup> (עשה שדהו מכר)<sup>60</sup> instead of a direct pledge (הלווה על שדה) then the creditor was entitled to keep the fruits he enjoyed during the period of the mortgage, if the debt were redeemed at maturity, although such income was tantamount to usury.

This startling opinion of R. Judah stirred the amoraim to find a precedent and a justification for it. Thus R. Yohanan<sup>61</sup> and two other amoraim observed that R. Judah deduced this principle from the generally accepted ruling concerning redemption of houses in a walled city מבתי ערי חומה למד ר' יהודה.

In the Babli, the opposite opinion is attributed to R. Johanan, namely that M. Arakin VI.3 actually represents the view of R. Judah, without stating explicitly that the underlying principle is צד אחד ברבית מותר<sup>62</sup> although it is presupposed.

However, the Babylonian Amoraim Samuel<sup>63</sup> and Abaye did

<sup>59</sup> However, in Roman Law, in the absence of a special agreement to the contrary, if a pledge were not paid at a certain time, the creditor could hold possession of the property as a purchaser, and must estimate the pledge at its just price D. 20.1.16.9. Weiss, *Pfandrechtliche Untersuchungen* p. 50 note 3. Buckland (*Text-Book on Roman Law* p. 477 note 4) says that the words *iusto . . . aestimandum* are interpolated, however, in a statement of Modestinus (D. 13.7.39) we find a reference to a case where Gaius Seius pledged his land to Lucius Titius as a security for a loan. Subsequently, Gaius Saius, the debtor affixed his signature to a will made by Lucius Titius, concerning a tract of land which read "*quem de Lucio emi*" but no deed of sale took place, but merely an agreement that the creditor should use the crops for a while, *cum nullum instrumentum venditionis proferatur, sed solum pactum, ut creditor certi temporis fructus caperet*.

<sup>60</sup> In the papyri we find references to the pledge going to the creditor in default of payment, cf. Gulak, p. 68 note 25, Taubenschlag p. 218 note 74.

<sup>61</sup> Y. B. M. V.2.

<sup>62</sup> Arakin 31a. This is more explicit in Meg. 27b, Yelin (יפה עינים) to Arakin 31a) already noticed the difficulty. If the tradition assigning this view to R. Johanan is authentic, which is more than doubtful, then the only way to solve the discrepancies is to answer in the language of the Talmud אמוראי יוחנן יניחו ואליבא דר' יוחנן.

<sup>63</sup> Samuel applied this principle in order to explain the statement כולם אם יושלו מזה in the baraita of R. Hoshaya (B. M. 63a).



definitely attribute to R. Judah the view צד אחד ברבית מותר which they discerned in the baraita הרי שהיה נושה בחבירו מנה. The principle underlying this doctrine was that R. Judah permitted usury in a transaction where there was a *chance* but not a *certainly* that interest would result, e. g. take the case of the creditor enjoying the produce of property mortgaged as a conditional sale; if the debt were redeemed, such income would be usury, if the mortgage were forfeited because of non-payment, there would not be any interest. R. Huna b. Joshua observed<sup>64</sup> that there were three rules governing a conditional transaction, which were at variance with the principle of צד אחד ברבית מותר whereas Raba repudiated the view that R. Judah ever espoused such a doctrine.<sup>65</sup>

The view צד אחד ברבית מותר attributed to R. Judah, according to which, the question of *uncertainty* is the principal factor calls to mind a rescript of Emperor Philip to Euxenus which reads as follows.<sup>66</sup> If your mother encumbered her property to her creditor on condition that he could acquire the fruits instead of interest: this agreement cannot be rescinded on the pretence that the value of the crops exceeded the interest, because of the *uncertainty* of the value of the future crops. *Si ea lege possessionem mater tua apud creditorem tuum obligavit, ut fructus in vicem usurarum consequeretur, obtentu maioris percepti emolumenti propter incertum fructuum eventum rescindi placita non possunt.*

As we have just shown, in Tannaitic times an antichretic loan on land resulting in usury was prohibited by all the scholars except R. Judah. The latter permitted it solely in the case of mortgaged land which was forfeited to the creditor, if it were not redeemed within a specified period (עשה שדהו מכר). However when we shift our attention to Babylonia of the Amoraic times to appraise and to subject to careful scrutiny, the rules concerning antichresis (משכנתא) we will notice a slight rebellion against the fixed purpose of the Tannaim to uphold every jot and tittle of the Biblical law of usury. The loyalty of the Amoraim to the

<sup>64</sup> B. M. 65b.

<sup>65</sup> B. M. 63a, Arakin 31b. According to Tosafot B. M. 63a s. v. רבית even Raba admits that R. Judah believes צד אחד ברבית מותר according to Biblical Law.

<sup>66</sup> C. IV.32.17.

law did not dull their sense of the instant need to maintain an adequate system of credit (כדי שלא תנעול דלת בפני לוויין B. M. 68a) which was put in jeopardy by the stringent laws against usury. Neither were they in any mood to shed any of the existing rules. Instead they eagerly seized upon a principle formulated by the Palestinian amora, R. Eleazar, namely, that Biblical usury could be claimed back by the debtor through judicial proceedings, but no action was available in the case of rabbinical usury,<sup>67</sup> ריבית קצוצה יוצאה בדינין אבק ריבית אינה יוצאה בדינין. The use of R. Eleazar's maxim, as a guide for practice constituted in itself a minor revolution in law. For the barring of an action in this wide field of law deprived the debtor of protection and eased the tension of the creditor who was chafing under the strict rules against usury. As Celsus<sup>68</sup> elegantly observed: An action is nothing else than the right to try to obtain through judicial proceedings what is one's due. *Nihil aliud est actio quam ius quod sibi debeat, iudicio persequendi*.

Now the rabbis were well aware of the fact that antichresis involving usury was practiced by the general populace in Babylonia. Rabina thought it important enough to note the basic difference between the Jewish and Persian forms.<sup>69</sup> והרי משכנתא בלא נכייחא דבר דנייהם מוציאין מלוה למלוה ובדינין אין מחזירין ממלוה ללוה. According to their law, (i. e. the Persian) the court will render judgment in favor of a creditor against the debtor in case of an antichretic loan if the latter collected the rent of the mortgaged property after the loan was contracted; although no provision for the reduction of the debt was made, since the profits could be applied to the amortization of the interest. In our Law (i. e. Jewish Law) in case of an antichretic loan without a stipulation for the reduction of the debt, the court will not afford relief to the debtor who wishes to recover the profits enjoyed by the creditor as it is only indirect usury.

<sup>67</sup> The view of R. Johanan בדינין נמי אינה יוצאה was rejected as being too radical, and too big a step in the abolition of the enforcement of the laws against usury, B. M. 61b.

<sup>68</sup> D. 44.7.51. for the literature on this passage, cf. Wenger, *Institutes of the Roman Law of Procedure*, 1940 p. 15 notes 23-24.

<sup>69</sup> B. M. 62a-b.

An ancient law-book which has preserved some curious legal usages current in the Orient in the fifth and sixth centuries reports the following practice<sup>70</sup> "If a man pledges a piece of land to his fellow on the condition that he keep the usufruct in lieu of usury the contract is valid **אן נמשכן וברא לנברא ארעא משכנא** וְהוּא תְּנִי בִּינְהוֹן דְּעִלְלָתָא דִּארְעָא נִסְבּ מוּפְנָא חֲלָף רַבִּיחָא דְכִסְפָּא שְׂרִי" **למופנא**.<sup>72</sup>

Thus the logic and the swirl of events compelled the rabbis to reckon with the ferment and turmoil that would result from a vigorous execution of the law, and its effect upon the public that clamored for some kind of an escape from the vexatious restriction of the law of usury. Consequently, it need occasion us no surprise to find such distinguished amoraim as Rabbah, Raba, Rabina, and R. Ashi, surely joined in maintaining a laissez-faire attitude<sup>73</sup> toward antichresis, provided it entailed only indirect usury<sup>74</sup> (**אבק רבית**). These amoraim differed among themselves primarily on the question as to what constitutes indirect usury.

The amoraic views on this theme precipitated wide divergencies of opinion among the early legal commentators, who propounded no less than five principal theories.<sup>75</sup> This is due to the brevity and ambiguity of the amoraic dicta on this very complicated legal phenomenon. Nevertheless we shall endeavor to express succinctly the historical phase and process as it appears to us.

<sup>70</sup> Syrian-Roman Law-Book Lex. 99.

<sup>71</sup> For **שריר** as a technical term in Hebrew documents, cf. B. B. 160b and Yer. Git. IX.50c **ויביר ובריר** cf. also L. Fischer, *Die Urkunden im Talmud* Berlin 1912, p. 27 note 3.

<sup>72</sup> In Aramaic **מלוא** is **מפנא** cf. Targ. Isa 24.2 whereas Targ. to Prov. 22.7 has the Syriac form **מופנא** and similarly, *Sheellot*. Behar no. 114.

<sup>73</sup> Maimonides, struck by the fact that the amoraim were debating in detail the antichresis they disapproved of, remarks as follows: **אע"פ שמשכונה זו אסורה היא ואבק רבית היא כמו שביארנו אפשר שיהיה זה בטעות או לגוי או דרך כל מי שחוטא ומשכן באותה מדינה הואיל ואבק רבית הולכין אחר המנהג** Malveh we-Loweh VII.5. Cf. also the statement of Alfasi **בריעבד אלא אלא להיתר אינו אלא** quoted by Bezalel Ashkenazi to B. M. 67a.

<sup>74</sup> Maimonides divides antichresis into three kinds, one which involves direct usury, the second, indirect usury, and the third is legitimate.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. Abraham de Boton **לום משנה** to Malveh we-Loweh VI.3, Tur, Yoreh Deah 172, Lampronti, *Pahad Yitzhak* s. v. **משכנא**.



Rabbah was of the following opinion. If a debtor pledged his field to a creditor without any express agreement (דלא קץ ליה)<sup>76</sup> the usufruct collected by the creditor was considered indirect usury. Hence the debtor could not sue for their return when the debt was liquidated. For Rabbah considered an antichretic loan like a sale with a contract to repurchase, in which case the usufruct consumed by the buyer was considered indirect usury.

Raba<sup>77</sup> had some misgivings over Rabbah's opinion because he ventured too far. Hence Raba ruled as follows *הא משכנתא באחרא דמסלקי אכל שיעור זוזי מסלקין ליה אכל טפי לא מפקין מיניה*. If an antichretic loan was made on a field, in a locality, where it was customary for the debtor to retain the right of redemption at any time, the court would order, at the petition of the debtor, the creditor to return the pledged estate, when the income he received from it, equaled the principal of the debt. However, if the debtor, through want of due diligence, failed to institute proceedings for the return of the property, until after the creditor had consumed fruits in excess of the debt, the court will withhold relief for the surplus. This is different from the first case where the debtor was vigilant as Rashi says *ואינו מניחו* אבל זה וזיו הוא ואינו מניחו. *לאכול אלא כדי קרן*. This conforms well with an old English legal maxim. *Vigilantibus et non dormientibus jura subveniunt*. Raba excepted the orphans from the application of the rule of laches.<sup>77a</sup>

R. Ashi discerned a serious inconsistency in Raba's view. He maintained that even if the debtor sued for the return of the property as soon as the revenue from the land equalled the debt, he was not entitled to the property, until he actually payed the debt,<sup>78</sup> for the creditor did not in the first place take the profits as a set-off to the debt (בחורה פרעון).

<sup>76</sup> Rashi remarks on this passage, *לא קץ ליה לאכול פירות לשם רבית אלא סתם*. ירר. Maimonides quotes a decision of his teachers which seems to go much beyond even the liberal view of Rabbah; namely, even if one mortgaged a field with the express condition that the creditor take the usufruct without setting it off against the debt, it is merely indirect usury. (VI.7 מלוה ולוה).

<sup>77</sup> B. M. 67a.

<sup>77a</sup> For a special provision for orphans in antichretic loans in the Syrian Roman Law, cf. Manigk, l. c. p. 72 ff.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. the statement of Marcianus. If a creditor has paid the money, he may make use of the action on the pledge, to recover the property given in

Rabina<sup>79</sup> makes it quite plain that **משכנתא בלא נכייתה**, i. e. an antichretic loan on land, with no stipulation for the creditor to give annual nominal contribution of the usufruct to the debtor, involves no more than indirect usury, and hence the debtor cannot sue for their return. However, a decision reported by R. Papi, that Rabina required the return of the usufruct in the case of a conditional sale with a contract to repurchase,<sup>80</sup> seems to clash with his general theory,<sup>81</sup> **עביר רבינא עובדא וחשיב ואפיק פירי דלא כרבה בר הונא**.

In the cases just enumerated, the rabbis tolerated the practice, and would not enforce the law in favor of the debtor. However, for him who wished to conduct himself with immovable scruple, Raba ruled as follows:<sup>82</sup> **האי משכנתא באחרא דלא מסלקי לא ניכול אלא בנכייתה**. An antichretic loan on land was perfectly legitimate in those localities where there was a right to redeem the loan at any time, if there was a token annual reduction of the debt. Raba's decision may be termed a signal triumph of equity over legal doctrine. As a direct comment upon his statement we have the penetrating observation of R. Papa and R. Huna b. R. Joshua.<sup>83</sup> According to them, a mortgage on land with the right of redemption had only the significance of a chattle mortgage (**מטלטלי**) to use a phrase of Rashi, since there was only transfer of possession. However, in the case where the right of redemption is withheld for a specified time, **באחרא דלא מסלקי** the estate

*ἀντίχρησις*, since it is a pledge. *Si pecuniam debitor solverit, potest pignoratitia actione uti ad recipiendam ἀντίχρησις: nam cum pignus sit, hoc verbo poterit uti.* D. 13.7.33, cf. Manigk l. c. p. 50 and Windscheid, *Lehrbuch des Pandektenrechts* I § 234 note 5.

<sup>79</sup> B. M. 62a–b.

<sup>80</sup> So this passage is explained by Alfasi in an Arabic responsum quoted by R. Bezalel to B. M. 67a.

<sup>81</sup> Tosafot B. M. 67a s. v. **פירי** try to solve the contradiction. A pupil of R. Peretz (quoted by R. Bezalel) and the Hagahot Maimuniyot to Malveh we-Loweh 7.1 assume that one of the Rabinas is the scholar who lived in the time of R. Joseph.

<sup>82</sup> B. M. 67b.

<sup>83</sup> The text in B. M. 67b from **נכייתה אפילו בנכייתה** to: **נצורבא מדרבנן אפילו בנכייתה** is an interpolation posterior to the time of Raba and Rabina.

passes to the mortgagee, for as Rashi puts it *דמכר הוא אצלו*.<sup>84</sup> Consequently, according to Raba, if the right of redemption were precluded during a given period, the antichretic loan was legitimate even if no nominal sum were given annually to the debtor as a partial application to the discharge of the debt. The theory underlying Raba's reasoning reminds one of the classical English mortgage, literally the dead pledge,<sup>85</sup> so called because the property was given to the creditor who received revenues without applying them to the satisfaction of the debt. The land was deemed dead to the debtor who derived no benefit from it while it was pledged.

Now Raba's rule was accepted by Rabina as a guide in his own personal business transactions, whereas R. Kahana, R. Papa and R. Ashi, demurred. Mar Zutra pointed out the justification for both points of view. According to him, the adherents of Raba's view justified it on the ground that it was analogous to the token payment made by the person who redeemed land he had consecrated to the sanctuary. Those who were opposed to it, held that the redemption of consecrated land was different from an antichretic loan with a token payment in lieu of the fruits, for it has the appearance of usury *הכא הלוואה ומחזי כריביית* (B. M. 68a) At a much later period subsequent to Mar Zutra,

<sup>84</sup> B. M. 67b s. v. *בשל חוב* and B. M. 67a s. v. *לא מסלקין לה*, Maimonides interprets this passage quite differently, cf. *מלוה ולוה* 7.1 and the commentators ad. loc.

<sup>85</sup> In Latin *vadium mortuum*. *Vadium*, derived from the classical Latin *vadimonium*, meaning pledge is found as early as 1179, cf. Du Cange, *Glossarium* s. v. *Vadium*, VIII. 227–228, Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England* II.157–158, and Roby, *Roman Private Law*. II 99 note 1. As a curiosity, I wish to cite the following: J. J. Powell (*A Treatise on the Law of Mortgages*, Boston 1828 vol. I) writes as follows on p. 1 "The notion of mortgaging and redemption are, by some, thought to have originated with the Jews," and he quoted as his sources Cunaeus pp. 11–14, and 2 *Ancient Universal History* pp. 130–131, and on p. 2 he writes "From the Jews the notion of mortgaging is said to have been derived to the Greeks and Romans". However, he admits that the English law of mortgage is mainly based on the Roman Law found in C. IV.52.2, and 7. Cf. also Pollock and Maitland, *The History of English Law*, Cambridge 1911, II. 120 et seq. and Rabinowitz, *The Story of the Mortgage Retold*, University of Pennsylvania Law Review, vol. 94 (1945) p. 12 et seq.



the feeling developed **לא ניכול** and **אפילו בנכייחא** that a scholar should not avail himself of Raba's lenient proposal.<sup>86</sup> For a scholar should be a personal example, and by his indulgence in this form of antichresis he may stimulate others to engage in real departures from the law. As Rashi well says: **שצריך ליישר דרכיו ולהתקדש אף במותר לו פן ילמדו ממנו לזלזל באיסורי**.

Consequently it was suggested that an antichretic loan known as **קיצותא** which was a modified form of **נכייחא** should be used. When it was noted that the legitimacy of **קיצותא** was a matter of controversy between R. Aha and Rabina II,<sup>87</sup> the **משכנתא דסורא** was proposed as the only form of antichresis that could be used even by a scholar with immunity from reproach.

The Antichresis of Sura was a written agreement which contained the following escape clause "at the expiration of a specified term of years this land will revert without any refund **במשלם** **שניא אילין חיפוק ארעא דא בלא כסף**. This was a device by which title to the estate passed for the time being to the mortgagee, and it was re-conveyed to the debtor at the time of payment.<sup>88</sup> Consequently the revenues received by the creditor in the meantime were not considered usury. This form of antichresis was entirely in keeping within the letter of the law, and inoffensive even to the most scrupulous.

While in later Talmudic times, it was expected of the scholar to be more careful than a layman in making an antichresis,<sup>89</sup>

<sup>86</sup> This will solve the difficulty of Tosafot B. M. 67b, s. v. **רבינא**.

<sup>87</sup> Both R. Aha and Rabina II were disciples of Rabina I and R. Ashi as was noted by F. Behr **דברי משולם** Frankfurt a. M. 1926 pp. 79-81.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. Rashi B. M. 68a **במעו** **האלו השנים האלו** remark that the creditor obtains title by virtue of the loan, and the instrument gives him the right of usufruct including the right to spread his fruit on the land, keep his animals there, and any other use he wishes to make of it. The principle underlying the antichresis of Sura presupposes a theory of mortgage akin to the *πρᾶσις ἐπὶ λύσει* of the Greeks, according to which, title passes immediately to the mortgagee so that a reconveyance becomes necessary upon the settlement of the debt, cf. Hitzig p. 5 ff., Swoboda, Z. S. S. 26: 224 Lipsius, p. 693 note 60, and p. 703, Weiss, p. 21, and Taubenschlag p. 206 note 6a, Maimonides **מלה ולם** VI.8 however remarks **שאין זה אלא כמי ששכר בפחיתות**.

<sup>89</sup> So R. Hananel quoted by Tosafot B. M. 67b s. v. **רבינא**.

in the post-Talmudic era this distinction was mostly forgotten, and the principal issue was to decide which form of antichresis may be used by all alike. In Geonic times, the Academy of Sura permitted antichresis even in the form of נכייטא whereas the Academy of Pumpedita considered the משכנתא דסורא only as legal.<sup>90</sup> In Spain in the eleventh century, we find Alfasi, battling in favor of the antichresis developed in Sura (משכנתא דסורא).

Already in the middle of the twelfth century, we find the prominent Provençal scholar, R. Moses ben Todros, Nasi of Narbonne,<sup>91</sup> introducing some innovations concerning antichretic loans where a nominal sum was given to the debtor in return for the usufruct נכייטא.<sup>92</sup> His regulations appeared to have influenced the Jewish practice in Spain. For in the time of R. Solomon ben Adret of Barcelona (1235–1310), antichresis by נכייטא became a regular institution<sup>93</sup> although the antichresis of Sura, was naturally permitted.

Now it is well known that the Canon law<sup>94</sup> was strictly opposed to usury and it seems possible that some Christians in Spain looking for relief from the severity of the Canon Law adopted the Jewish antichretic form of loan known as the Antichresis of Sura. An allusion to this practice is found in *Las Siete Partidas* V. 11.40 where we read as follows:<sup>95</sup> Moreover, we decree that any contract or agreement made in the presence of witnesses, or in writing, in order to evade usury, shall not be observed.

<sup>90</sup> Cf. Lewin, ספר מהיבות, Jerusalem 1934 p. 70.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. Gross, *Gallia Judaica* p. 407.

<sup>92</sup> Quoted by Samuel ha-Sardi, *Sefer ha-Terumot* 46.3, ed. Venice 1643 f. 226 d and Bezalel Ashkenazi to B. M. 67b, ed. Brooklyn 1943 p. 314.

<sup>93</sup> Cf. Joseph ibn Habib in his *Nimuke Joseph* on Alfasi, to B. M. 67b.

<sup>94</sup> Cf. Sägmüller, *Lehrbuch des katholischen Kirchenrechts* II, 1914 pp. 387–388.

<sup>95</sup> Ed. Gregorio Lopez, Paris 1847. *Otrozi decimos que todo pleyto ó postura que sea fecha ante testigos ó por carta en engaño de usura que non debe seer guardada: et esto serie quando aquel que presta los dineros en verdat toma por ellos algunt heredamiento por peños, et face muestra de fuera que aquel que gelo da á peños que gelo vende, faciéndose ende facer carta de vëndida por que pueda ganar los frutos, et que non le puedan seer demandados por usura: et por ende decimos que tal engaño como este non debe valer, seyendo probado tal pleyto que verdaderamente fue préstamo, et la carta de la vëndida fue facha por ensinta.*

This would be the case where a party who lends money honestly, takes some of the property as security for it, and makes it appear that the party who gives it as security sells it to him,<sup>96</sup> and causes him to make for that purpose a deed of sale that he may obtain the fruits of that property without being accused of usury. Consequently we decree that fraud of this kind shall not be valid where the contract is proved, and the loan was genuine and the deed of sale was executed in fraud."

Antichretic loans involving usury were specifically forbidden by Pope Alexander III in 1163. Thus, as Lea<sup>97</sup> tells us, "*Superabundantia*"<sup>97a</sup> — a term borrowed from St. Jerome — was usury; it meant obtaining some profit in addition to the principal, as when a field was hypothecated as security, and the lender enjoyed its fruits during the existence of the loan; all such fruits were to be computed as partial payments, though already there had commenced exceptions in favor of the Church, for, if a layman held a piece of Church property, clerics lending money on it could enjoy the fruits, which Bernard<sup>97b</sup> says seems strange, but

<sup>96</sup> This is reminiscent of the ancient *ὡς ἂν ἐν πίστει* of the Greeks and Egyptians, cf. Rabel Z. S. S. 1907, 351 ff., and Weiss, *Pfandrechtliche Studien* I.21. It was known to the Jews as (*πίστις*) שטר פיסטית T. B. B. II.3, cf. Gulak, תולדות המשפט בישראל I. 1939, p. 63–64. In Canon Law, these simulated sale contracts were prohibited as usury. Cf. T. P. McLaughlin, The Teaching of the Canonists on Usury, in *Medieval Studies* I. 1939 pp. 115–117. It is similarly disallowed in Moslem Law, cf. Khalil, *Code Musulman, Texte Arabe et Nouvelle Traduction* par N. Seignette, Constantine 1878 p. 34, and Juynboll, *Handbuch des Islamischen Gesetzes*, 1910 p. 276 note 1.

<sup>97</sup> The Ecclesiastical Treatment of Usury reprinted in his *Minor Historical Writings*, 1942 p. 131. For the strict prohibition of antichresis in Canon Law, cf. the detailed references by McLaughlin, l. c. pp. 113–115. That antichresis was frequent in later medieval Germany was already remarked by J. H. Boehmer in a note to his edition of the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, Halle-Magdeburg 1747 vol. II, p. 335.

<sup>97a</sup> In Lev. 25.37 the Vulgate translates הרבית by *superabundantia*. Dr. B. Nelson informs me that Jerome in his commentary on Ezek. 18.8 refers to *superabundantia* in connection with הרבית and Robert de Curzon (died 1219) uses the term *superabundantia* with reference to Ezekiel, cf. *Le Traite De Usura de Robert de Courçon*, ed. Georges Lefevre, Lyon 1902, p. 5.

<sup>97b</sup> Bernard of Pavia (died 1213) *Summa Decretalis* ed. E. A. T. Laspeyres, Ratisbon 1860, Lib V, Tit. XV, 3, 5, 12. For the exceptions with regard to church property, Dr. B. Nelson informs me that the most recent study on the



that it is not for gain, but to enable them to redeem the property from the layman." The rule applied also to chattel, "The theory of *superabundantia* required that if a pledge were a house, or a coat, or a bed, an agreement that the lender could use it while in his possession was usurious, and of course a house could not be occupied."<sup>98</sup>

A serious disagreement arose among the medieval French scholars concerning the validity of an antichretic loan on apartments. Rashi tells us crisply and directly that an antichresis with a nominal stipulated annual reduction is illegal with respect to houses because it is unlike an antichresis on land. In the latter, the uncertainty exists that the land will yield little or no crops, *הוה ליה קונה את הפירות בכייתא זו על ספק* whereas in the matter of renting a house, the creditor is sure to benefit by it, as he continually lives on it.<sup>99</sup> R. Tam takes the stand that an element of chance appears also with regard to apartments, for the house may cave in, burn down, or the creditor may no longer be in need of it.<sup>100</sup> The Yerushalmi records a ruling of R. Ami who permitted an antichretic loan on a house over against the objections of R. Hezekiah, on the grounds that a house is improved by its tenants who make the necessary repairs while living there<sup>101</sup> *ביתא עם דיירא דאיר*.

In Roman law, too, the speculative element enters into every antichresis involving usury. Thus from a rescript of Alexander in 234 C. E. we learn that if a woman lent money on condition that she should live in the house of the debtor in lieu of interest,

subject is by H. Van Wiervke, *Le Morte Gage et son Rôle économique en Flandres et en Lotharingie*, in *Revue Belge de Philologie et de l'Histoire* VIII. 1929, pp. 53-91.

<sup>98</sup> Lea l. c. p. 135.

<sup>99</sup> B. M. 64b s. v. *קא משמע לן* Rashi stresses the point elsewhere that the element of chance eliminates from the transaction its character of direct usury, cf. B. M. 62b. s. v. *רבניא* and 67b, s. v. *באחרא*, Maimonides agrees with Rashi, cf. *מלוה ולוה* VI.7.

<sup>100</sup> Cf. Tosafot B. M. 64b, s. v. *ולא*. The compiler of this Tosafot agrees with Rashi that *בבית לא שייך חיורא ושום ספק* in the light of M. Arakin IX.3, cf. B. M. 73a and Tosafot B. M. 64a s. v. *מה*.

<sup>101</sup> B. M. V.2, cf. also the reading in *עיטור* ed. Vilna 1883 I. p. 131 s. v. *פוחיקי*.

then the debtor can not raise the question that he could have collected more money, had he rented it out to some one else, and as it is, he is collecting less rent than the house is worth. The contract for the interest is not illegitimate, for that was the chance he was taking. *Si ea pactione uxor tua mutuam pecuniam dedit, ut vice usurarum inhabilaret, pactoque ita ut convenit usa est, non etiam locando domum pensionem redegit, referri quaestionem, quasi plus domus redigeret, si locaretur, quam usurarum legitimarum ratio colligit, minime oportet. licet enim uberiore sorte potuerit contrahi locatio, non ideo tamen illicitum fenus esse contractum, sed vilius conducta habitatio videtur.*<sup>102</sup>

To sum up the story of antichresis: References to loans with security on land where the creditor probably enjoyed the usufruct until the debt was paid, may be traced to Biblical times.<sup>103</sup> In the Tannaitic era, there was a marked tendency to interpret the laws of usury strictly, and consequently many forms of transactions were pronounced usurious which were not explicitly declared as such in the ancient law. It was therefore most natural for the Tannaim to look askance upon antichretic loans on land resulting in direct usury.

A single exception was R. Judah who permitted the creditor to keep the fruits of the land given in security for a loan, if the terms of the contract contained a penalty clause for forfeiture.<sup>104</sup> The Amoraim debated the source of R. Judah's liberal doctrine which made possible an evasion of the Law. According to R. Johanan it was based on the Scriptural precedent which per-

<sup>102</sup> C. IV.32. 14, cf. Manigk, p. 56 note 1. For the doctrine *periculum sortis* cf. Benali Fekar, *L'Usure en Droit Musulman*, Paris 1908 p. 117.

<sup>103</sup> Cf. Neh. V.3, and Cook, *The Laws of Moses and the Code of Hammurabi*, 1903. p. 235, and H. M. Weill, *Gage et Cautionnement dans le Bible* in *Archives d'Histoire de Droit Orientale* II. 1938, p. 176 et seq. Rostovtzeff and Welles in *Yale Classical Studies*, II. 1931, pp. 68-69 and Bickerman, *Gnomon* VIII. 1932, p. 575.

<sup>104</sup> The Amoraim objected in general to a conventional penalty agreement on the ground that an *Asmakta* is invalid. For the concept, cf. Blau, *M.G.W.J.* 63 (1919) p. 142 et seq. For the conventional penalty in Roman Law, cf. M. Pergament, *Conventionalstrafe und Interesse*, Berlin 1896, (cf. Geib, *Z. S. S.* 17, pp. 354-357) and Sjörden, *Über die Römische Conventionalstrafe*, Berlin 1896, (cf. review by Pergament, *Z. S. S.* 18, 299-307).

mitted the vendor to redeem a home in a walled city. Some Babylonian scholars maintained that R. Judah developed or formulated the principle **צד אחד ברבית מותר**. According to this doctrine, a commercial transaction or a simulated sale, which *might* result in usury, was permissible, since it was contingent upon the vendor's repurchasing the property.<sup>105</sup> The element of uncertainty (*incertum*) was similarly reckoned with in Roman Law.<sup>106</sup>

In Jewish as well as in Roman and Greek law, the use of the pledge given in security for a loan was originally disallowed but the rule was relaxed when it was realized that advantages would accrue to both debtor and creditor. Generally speaking, when the revenue collected from the pledge or mortgage by the creditor surpassed the original sum of the loan, the surplus was to be returned. Thus in a rescript of Emperors Severus and Antoninus of the year 207 C. E. addressed to Metrodorus which was obviously intended for the Greeks in the Roman provinces we read:<sup>107</sup> *οἱ ἐκ τοῦ ἐνεχύρου ληφθέντες καρποὶ ψηφίζονται εἰς τὸ χρέος καὶ ἐὰν ἱκανοὶ γένωνται πρὸς τὸ ὅλον χρέος, λύεται ἡ ἀγωγὴ*<sup>108</sup> *καὶ ἀποδίδεται τὸ ἐνέχυρον εἰ δὲ καὶ πλεονέες εἰσι τοῦ χρέους οἱ καρποί, ἀποδίδονται οἱ περιττεύοντες.*

However, in Roman and Greek law, since usury was permitted, the usufruct enjoyed by the creditor was set off against the interest, but in Jewish law as interest was altogether banned,

<sup>105</sup> Cf. R. Gershon to Arak. 31a, Rashi l. c. and to B. M. 63a, 65b; Tosafot (B. M. 63a s. v. **צד**) further delimits the principle as follows: A transaction, ultimately resulting in usury is permitted, if the contract were legitimate at the time it was made **של צד אחד** **היו רבית כיון דבשעת הפסק היו צד אחד** **של ואע"ג דבשעת הפרעון היו רבית** **הפסק היו צד אחד** **היה שרי**, and the element of uncertainty must be the consequence of an act of the creditor or debtor, and not because of something beyond their control **ויש לומר דלא חשיב צד אחד ברבית אלא דבר שיש ביד מלוה או לוה לעשות צד אחד שלא יהא רבית**. Strashun (Arakin 31a) raises the question that an ordinary case of loan should also fall under the category of **צד אחד ברבית** since it will be released by the Sabbatical year, if it is not paid before.

<sup>106</sup> Cf. above note 66.

<sup>107</sup> C. 4.24.1.

<sup>108</sup> *ἀγωγὴ* = *actio* is derived from *ἄγειν* to lead before a court, cf. Wenger, *Institutes of the Roman Law of Procedure*, p. 12 note 4, for *ἀγορά* meaning, a court of justice, cf. Boaz Cohen, *Some Remarks on the Law of Persons in Jewish and Roman Jurisprudence* p. 37 note 153.



the public was forced to fall back on its own resources to discover some device to circumvent the ironclad law against usury. In Babylonia, in the Amoraic era, three principal types of antichresis became prevalent, which met with the avowed disapproval of the rabbis, but not with their determined resistance, since they branded these practices merely as indirect usury, for which there was no remedy in the halls of the law. Thus Rabbah, disapproved of the practice whereby the creditor tacitly enjoyed the fruits of the land mortgaged to him. This reminds one of the tacit antichresis in Roman law alluded to by Paulus in Digest 20.2.8 cited above.<sup>109</sup> Raba did not allow an action where the creditor had enjoyed revenues from the mortgage beyond the principal, although the debtor had the right of redemption *הא משכנתא באחרא דמסלקי . . . אבל טפי לא מפקין מיניה*, Rabina considered the enjoyment of such profits by the creditor as indirect usury only if the latter failed to give to the debtor a nominal sum each year.<sup>110</sup> (*משכנתא בלא נכייחא*).

The two forms of antichresis approved of as wholly legitimate in Babylonia were the antichretic loan known as *משכנתא בנכייחא* and the *Mashkanta di Sura*.<sup>111</sup> Both forms of antichresis constituted in actuality evasions of usury, under the guise of a fictitious sale. The acceptance by the amoraim of these patent subterfuges as within the letter of the law, speaks eloquently of the profound compulsion to which they were subjected, in order to secure a stable economy with the free flow of credit.

As a mere literary curiosity or coincidence, we wish to underscore the fact that the term *ἀντίχρησις* occurs only four times in all of the ancient legal writings. Once in the Greco-Egyptian papyri of the second century, twice by Marcianus in the Digest, and once in the Palestinian Talmud. Instances of later use of the term all go back to the Digest.

<sup>109</sup> Cf. above note 37.

<sup>110</sup> *Tosafot* (Arakin 31a s. v. והחניא) explains why this kind of antichresis is not put in the category of direct usury.

<sup>111</sup> The Talmud records several actual cases of antichretic loans on lands, cf. B. M. 109b Ket 95b, B. M. 110a B. B. 32b, and 40b. The Mortgages lasted from between three to ten years. From B. M. 110a, it is clear that Rabina and R. Ashi were familiar with the antichresis of Sura, cf. above note 83.

# THE REGION OF THE PERSIAN GULF AND ITS JEWISH SETTLEMENTS IN ISLAMIC TIMES

By WALTER J. FISCHEL

## 1

### INTRODUCTION

It has rightly been observed that the inland waters known as the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea resemble two arms which nature has stretched out in order to unite India and Europe. Both are, indeed, two great almost parallel prolongations of the Indian Ocean penetrating into the very center of the Old World and giving access to and from Europe. The annals of the Persian Gulf in general are well known, for it has been one of the most important maritime highways for the commerce of the world, one of the great arteries of communication, into which people of all races and creeds have incessantly sent their messengers, their armies, envoys, diplomats, merchants, explorers, missionaries and scholars.<sup>1</sup>

Strangely enough, however, this region of the Persian Gulf has escaped the attention of Jewish scholars, and it remained an utterly neglected and unknown territory on the map of the Jewish Diaspora.

The following study is intended to fill in that gap and to outline the connection of the Persian Gulf with Jews and Jewish events from Islamic times on and to show that this region has been a seat of Jewish settlement throughout the ages and a scene of Jewish activity and creativeness.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> There exists a considerable literature on the Persian Gulf and its history. It might be sufficient to refer here only to Arnold T. Wilson: *The Persian Gulf, an historical sketch from the earliest times to the beginning of the 20th Century*, Oxford 1928; probably the most recent and comprehensive survey with a valuable bibliography. See also: R. Vadala: *Le golfe persique*, Paris, 1921.

<sup>2</sup> This study suggested itself to the author when he, in the fall of 1940, flew over the whole region of the Persian Gulf en route from Palestine via Basra to India, Australia, and the U. S. A.

In his study on "The Jewish Factor in Medieval Civilization" Salo Baron<sup>3</sup> remarks that "a more thorough investigation of all localities where Jews were found and of the number, absolute and relative, of Jews inhabiting them would undoubtedly shed new light on the importance of the Jewish factor in their evolution." Though referring only to the Jews in Medieval Europe, this statement can and should be applied also to the Jews of other continents, particularly to the Jews in the Islamic Orient. It will require, however, lengthy and difficult research to give a satisfactory answer to the manifold demographic problems of Oriental Jewry in the various countries and at various historical periods, but no effort should be spared to obtain with the help of the available sources, scattered and scanty though they are, a clear conception of the geographical distribution, the numerical strength, and the sociological, economical and cultural structure of the Jewish communities in the Islamic Orient in general.

The most fruitful method for the elucidation of "The Jewish factor in Medieval Islam" seems to be a regional approach, a method previously employed for areas such as Kurdistan and Khorasan,<sup>4</sup> which by its very concentration on a specific geographical area, by its deliberate limitation to one region, offers the greatest possibility of a reliable and factual presentation.

## 2

### GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION BEFORE THE 16TH CENTURY

In turning first to the geographical distribution of Jewish settlements in this region<sup>5</sup> it appears that one of the earliest Jewish communities was at B a h r a i n. Bahrain, the small

<sup>3</sup> *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, New York, 1942, Vol. XII, p. 4.

<sup>4</sup> See the present writer's studies: "The Jews of Kurdistan, a hundred years Ago" in *Jewish Social studies*, New York, 1944, Vol. VI, pp. 195-226, and "The Jews of Central Asia (Khorasan) in Medieval Hebrew and Islamic Literature" in *Historia Judaica*, New York, 1945, Vol. VII, pp. 29-50.

<sup>5</sup> The investigation of the pre-Islamic association of Jews with the Persian Gulf area has been excluded here. Excluded, also, is Bushir and the coast of



stretch of coastland along the Arabian shore of the Persian Gulf from Basra down to the south, and including many small islands, had already under the control of Sassanid Persia a very complex population, which consisted of Zoroastrians, Christians, Arab tribesmen and Jews. The origin of the Jewish settlement undoubtedly goes back to the early Christian centuries. If we accept the assumption that Oriental Christianity spread first into places where Jewish communities were already in existence, then Bahrain and the East coast of Arabia in general must have had a Jewish population at a very early date.<sup>6</sup>

The Jewish settlement in Bahrain came into the brighter light of history, however, only when Islam started its victorious march through Arabia and when Mohammed dispatched his troops to conquer this Persian-controlled territory. On that occasion, in the year 630, the Jews in Bahrain, more exactly in its capital, Hajar, are expressly mentioned in Arabic sources<sup>7</sup> as having refused to accept Islam. They preferred to pay the poll-tax (Jizya) and to accept the status of "Ahl adh-Dhimma" (protected people); and as such they could continue their religious existence undisturbed for many centuries. Qirqisāni, the Karaite scholar and traveler of the 10th century,<sup>8</sup> and other sources,<sup>9</sup> furnish

the province of Fars, which will be dealt with separately. For Basra, see D. S. Sassoon: *The History of the Jews in Basra in J. Q. R.*, Vol. XVII N.S., 1927, pp. 407–469. S. H. Longrigg: *Four centuries of Modern Iraq*, Oxford 1925.

<sup>6</sup> See K. Scott Latourette: *History of the Expansion of Christianity*, New York, 1937, Vol. I, pp. 51–53, pp. 103–234. A. Mingana: *The Early Spread of Christianity in Central Asia and the Far East*, Manchester, 1925, and the well known studies of Noeldeke, Sachau and Labourt.

<sup>7</sup> See al-Beladhori: *Futūh al-Buldān*, ed. de Goeje, Leyden, 1866, pp. 77, 6; 78, 11; 79, 5. M. Sperber: *Die Schreiben Mohammeds an die Staemme Arabiens*, in *Mitt. d. Sem. f. Orient. Sprachen*, Berlin, 1916, Vol. 19, pp. 22, 23, 32.

<sup>8</sup> See Ya'qūb al-Qirqisāni, *Kitāb al-Anwār wal-Marāqib* (Code of Karaite Law) ed. Leon Nemoy, New York 1939, Vol. I, pp. 135, 15; 140, 7.

<sup>9</sup> Istakhri, *Kitāb Masālik al-Mamālik*, ed. de Goeje, Leyden 1870, and 2nd ed. by J. H. Kramers, Leyden 1927, p. 19, and particularly the Persian note 19a. See F. Wuestenfeld, *Bahrein und Jamama nach arabischen Geographien*, 1874, p. 177. Yaqūt: *Mu'jam al-Buldān* ed. F. Wuestenfeld, Leipzig, 1866–73, Vol. IV, p. 953, s. v. Hajar.

ample evidence of the existence of a Jewish settlement in their time.<sup>10</sup>

Oman, the territory south of Bahrain, on the tip of the Arabian peninsula and on the very outlet of the Persian Gulf into the Indian Ocean, also was a seat of Jewish activities.

The presence of Jewish merchants in Oman is well attested for the 10th century by a Persian ship captain, Buzurg ibn Shahriyar of Ramhormuz (900–953)<sup>11</sup> in his story about a wealthy Jew, Isaak of Oman, who after a dispute with another Jew in Oman, left Oman and went to India; but after an absence of thirty years, returned on his own ship with a tremendous fortune gained as a result of his commercial activities. In arranging the customs and the payment of the tithe, Isaak came to an understanding with the governor of Oman, Ahmad ibn Hillāl, which involved a sum of more than a million dirhams. The great fortune of Isaak, so it is reported, had aroused the jealousy of the officials in Baghdad, to whom it was pointed out that “a man had left Oman without anything and had come back on a ship laden with a million dinars worth of musk, as well as silks and porcelain of equal value and quite as much again in jewelry and stones, not counting a whole heap of marvelous objects of Chinese workmanship.” Isaak became aware of an order from Baghdad to arrest him, he hurried all his possessions together, put them on ship-board, and set sail again for China without leaving a dinar behind in Oman.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>10</sup> References to the Jews in Bahrain during the nineteenth century are frequently made by travelers, such as D. G. Hogarth: *The Penetration of Arabia* 1904; A. Zehme: *Arabien und die Araber* 1875; J. J. Benjamin II, H. A. Stern and others. See David Gustinsky: The Jews on the Island of Bahrain” (Hebrew) in *Edoth* Jerusalem, 1946, Vol. I, p. 238–240, which deals briefly with the small colony of Jewish settlers of today.

<sup>11</sup> See his *The Marvels of India, published from the Arabic* by L. Marcel Devic, London 1928, pp. 92–95.

<sup>12</sup> It is significant that the “Radanites”, that group of Jewish merchants from Western Europe who traveled during the ninth century to the East as far as China and India have also used Oman as one of their ports of call in their seaborne trade activities. About them see Ibn Khordadbeh ed. de Goeje (*Bibl. Geogr. Arab.*) Vol. VI, Leyden 1889, p. 153, and Ibn al-Fakih ed. de Goeje (*Bibl. Geogr. Arab.*), Vol. V, p. 270.

Also Siraf on the Persian shore of the Persian Gulf was the seat of a Jewish settlement towards the end of the 10th century. Siraf became at that time the principal port, an international trading center, for the whole Orient, where merchandise from and for Yemen, India and China, was loaded and unloaded. It was one of the most prosperous trade stations, and the merchants of Siraf were regarded as the wealthiest of all Persia. Their luxurious houses and mansions, as well as their enormous fortunes have been mentioned by Arabic geographers. In this prosperity of Siraf, Jews also participated very prominently. We do not know the size of the Jewish community, but its prominence is attested by the fact that the governor of that city for some time was a Jew by the name of Ruzbah, or Roz-bih (Yomtob).<sup>13</sup>

Siraf served also as the center of Jewish commercial activities for the more remote Jewish communities in the interior of Persia. The principal towns of the Persian provinces, Fars and Khuzistan, had large Jewish communities which occupied an important economic position. The greater part of the merchants of Tustar in the province of Fars, we are explicitly told, were Jews. In Isfahan, the so-called "Yahudiyya" quarter had long been known as a great center of trade and commerce. In Ahwaz, in the province of Khuzistan, Jewish money changers and bankers had a prominent position. And it was just at this time that the famous Jewish banking firm in Baghdad of Joseph ben Phineas and Aaron ben Amram conducted their widespread international activities in the field of finance and commerce.<sup>14</sup>

When Siraf ceased to play its prominent role in the 11th century, the island of Kish (Kais) in the Persian Gulf became the great emporium of the overseas trade to India. It is highly significant that the Jews moved along with the shifting of the commercial centers in the Persian Gulf, for Benjamin of Tudela (1160-1173), the earliest of all European visitors to the Orient (since Arrian's narrative of Nearchus) whose travel story has

<sup>13</sup> See: *The Eclipse of the Abbasid Caliphate* edit. and transl. by H. F. Amedroz and D. S. Margoliouth, Oxford 1921, Vol. III, p. 149-150, Vol. VI, p. 155.

<sup>14</sup> For documentary evidence of these references see Walter J. Fischel: *Jews in the Economic and Political Life of Medieval Islam*, London 1937, p. 32 ff. (Royal Asiatic Society Monographs Vol. XXII)



come down to us, observes that "Kish is a considerable market, being the point to which the Indian merchants and those of the islands bring their commodities while the traders of Mesopotamia, Shinear, Media, Yemen and Persia import all sorts of silk and purple clothes, flax, cotton, and other objects of exchange . . . . The inhabitants of the island live by what they gain in the capacity of brokers to both parties. Five hundred Jews live in Kish."<sup>15</sup>

The reference in the Gaonic literature by R. Hai Gaon (990-1038), the famous leader of Jewry of his time, to "Jews on the islands of the Persian Sea" (איי הים של פרס) might indicate that R. Hai had knowledge of scattered Jewish colonies in that region.<sup>16</sup> If these "islands" could be taken as including also the island of Kish, we have here documentary evidence that the Jewish settlement there existed over a hundred years previous to Benjamin of Tudela's visit.

Katifa, belonging to the Bahrain territory, also had a considerable Jewish settlement in Medieval Islam. Katifa was famous for its pearl fishery, and Benjamin of Tudela's description of it shows that this trade was controlled by Jews, of whom five thousand were supposed to have lived there.<sup>17</sup>

## 3

## THE PORTUGUESE POWER IN THE PERSIAN GULF

The association of Jews with the Persian Gulf from the end of the 12th century on seems to have been interrupted; at least no mention of them is made in the extant sources. This complete

<sup>15</sup> *The Itinerary of Rabbi Benjamin of Tudela*, ed. A. Asher, New York 1840, Vol. I, p. 136, Vol. II, p. 175.

<sup>16</sup> See J. Mann: The Responsa of the Babylonian Geonim as a source of Jewish history in *J. Q. R.* 1917, n. s., Vol. VII, p. 471. L. Ginzberg: *Geonica*. New York 1909, Vol. II, p. 279, which does not contain the reference to the islands of Persia.

<sup>17</sup> About the reliability of Benjamin of Tudela's figures and data pertaining to the trans-Tigris territories see A. T. Wilson: *Early Spanish and Portuguese Travelers in Persia*, London 1927, pp. 4-7; also P. Borchardt in *Jahrbuch d. Jued. Lit. Ges.* Frankfurt o-m. 1924, p. 20.

silence could well be attributed to the inadequacy of sources. It might, however, indicate the actual disappearance of the Jewish communities in this area, through migration, perhaps to India, through transplanting to other parts of Persia during the Seljuk and Mongol rule, or through disintegration and dissolution. Only about four hundred years after Benjamin of Tudela, in the 16th century, new light breaks through and the available sources confront us again suddenly with the presence of Jews in the area of the Persian Gulf.

The reestablishment of the Jewish association with the region of the Persian Gulf from the 16th century on seems to be, to a great extent, due to two factors, namely, the establishment of the Portuguese colonial empire in the Orient and the new policy of the Persian Shah, Abbas the First (1587-1629).

After the discovery of the sea route to India around the Cape of Good Hope, the Portuguese, the pioneers of the maritime nations in Europe, became the first European nation to establish a foothold in the Persian Gulf. D'Albuquerque, the Portuguese viceroy of India, recognized the importance of the Persian Gulf when he stated that "there are three places in India which serve as marts of all the commerce of merchant-wares in that part of the world, and the principal keys of it: The first is Malacca, the second is Aden . . . . the third is Ormuz . . . at the entry and exit of the trade of the Persian sea. This city of Ormuz is according to my idea the most important of them all. Ormuz by reason of its commerce and navigable position is very much renowned throughout the whole world."<sup>18</sup>

When the Portuguese penetrated into the waters of the Persian Gulf and conquered in 1507 the island of Ormuz, Jews, mostly of Portuguese origin, appear with them on the scene. Jews, then as always the great travelers on land and sea, participated actively in the exploration of the Portuguese colonial empire

<sup>18</sup> See Afonso D'Albuquerque, *"The Commentaries . . ."* Hakluyt Society Publications, London, 1883, Vol. IV, p. 185. The Portuguese kings styled themselves "Lords of the Conquests, Navigation and Commerce of India, Ethiopia, Arabia and Persia" (see Wilson, l. c. p. 111). G. W. F. Stripling: *The Ottoman Turks and the Arabs (1511-1574)* Univ. of Ill. Press 1942 (with a very valuable bibliography).

and played a role as guides, interpreters, and advisors to the Portuguese explorers and administrators in the Orient. It is known that d'Albuquerque himself had several Jews as interpreters in his service, one of them, Alexander d'Atayde, an excellent linguist, called Hucefe of Castilia after his conversion to Christianity, became an intimate friend and confidential adviser of d'Albuquerque and participated actively in the capture and surrender of Ormuz. Portuguese sources report other Jewish advisers who were sent to Ormuz with important assignments in the interest of the state.<sup>19</sup>

These Portuguese-Jewish individuals, however, can hardly be regarded as permanent residents of Ormuz or of any other place along the Persian Gulf, and though the Portuguese penetration into the waters of the Persian Gulf made this region most attractive for the merchants of Europe and Asia, a much more potent factor seems to account for the appearance and prominence of Jewish settlements in the region of the Persian Gulf from that period on.

#### 4

#### JEWS UNDER THE SAFAVID DYNASTY

It seems, namely, that it was the transformation of Persia under Shah Abbas I that was responsible for the renewed Jewish association with that region. As generally known, with the Arab conquest of Persia in 641, Persia ceased to be an independent country and became a province within the great empire of the Umayyad and Abbasid Caliphs. Despite several attempts to regain independence for Persia, only some parts of the once great Sassanian empire could reconstitute their life temporarily, on a national, independent basis. Even the Mongol conquest of Persia and Hulagu's destruction of Baghdad and the Abbasid Caliphate in 1258 made Persia only another province, now of the great Il-Khan empire, into which it was incorporated.

<sup>19</sup> See M. Kayserling: *Christopher Columbus and the Participation of Jews in the Spanish and Portuguese Discoveries*, New York 1894, pp. 18-19, 120-121; R. S. Whiteway: *The Rise of Portuguese Power in India*, Westminster 1899, p. 53-57. E. Prestage: *The Portuguese Pioneers*, London 1933, p. 218.



With the rise of the Safavid Dynasty at the beginning of the 16th century (1501), however, the political status of Persia was fundamentally changed. It was under this new dynasty that Persia attained again a position of independence, power, and glory, which it had not enjoyed since the destruction of the Sassanid empire more than eight centuries earlier.<sup>20</sup>

Shah Abbas I (1587-1629), the most outstanding of the Safavid rulers, introduced far-reaching reforms not only in order to destroy the theoretic basis of the State which his predecessors had built up, not only to crush its ancient tribal feudalism and free Persia from the fetters of its all too powerful Shia clergy, but also to break the political and economic isolation of Persia.<sup>21</sup> Shah Abbas I, realizing that the most urgent requirement for Persia was increased population and economic ties with the outside world, changed the policy of the state towards non-Muslims and foreigners fundamentally. Far from being as antagonistic as his predecessors<sup>22</sup> were toward Europeans and

<sup>20</sup> For general reference consult: G. Curzon: *Persia and the Persian Question*, London 1892; P. M. Sykes: *A History of Persia*, London 1921; E. G. Browne: *A Literary History of Persian Literature*, London 1906 ff.

<sup>21</sup> The period of the Safavid rule over Persia is still in many ways obscure and unexplored. The social and economic background of the Safavid state and its organization has been investigated for the first time fundamentally by V. Minorsky in his brilliant introduction to *Tadhkirat al-Mulūk, A Manual of Safavid Administration*, Facsimile with Translation and Commentary, in *E. J. W. Gibb Memorial* n. s., London 1943, Vol. VI.

<sup>22</sup> The founder of the dynasty, Shah Ismael I (1502-1524) brought about along with the national rehabilitation of Persia a religious change of far-reaching consequences by his introduction of Shi'a Islam as official state religion of Persia. One of the chief results of the Shi'a revival was the overwhelming influence of the clergy over all affairs of the State. The intolerant and fanatical attitude against foreigners and non-Muslims, based on the conception of their ritual uncleanness affected Sunni Moslems not less than Europeans, Christians, Zoroastrians, and Jews in Persia. Typical for the spirit of that early period of the Safavid rule is the following: The English traveler and merchant, Anthony Jenkinson, came to Persia in 1561 equipped with letters of credential from Queen Elizabeth of England in order to establish commercial relations between England and Persia. Shah Tahmasp (1524-1576) refused to have any dealings with European Christian nations and demanded the immediate removal of Jenkinson from the soil of Persia which he had contaminated. (See Anth. Jenkinson: *Early Voyages and Travels to*

non-believers, he encouraged the immigration of foreigners, merchants, settlers, and artisans from neighboring countries such as Armenia, Georgia, Turkey, and also from Europe. By granting freedom of religion and special privileges and facilities to all those who were ready to come to his territory, he was able to succeed in this purpose. It was this new attitude which made Persia at that time the meeting-place of European envoys, emissaries, diplomats, merchants-adventurers, missionaries — all eager to obtain commercial, political or religious concessions and privileges. Never before in the history of Persia's relationship with the outside world were the ties between Persia and Europe, economically and politically, closer.<sup>23</sup>

This attitude of the Shah also had its beneficial effect on the Jews of the neighboring countries, as the sources, though scanty, allow us to recognize, and Jews, too, availed themselves of the new trend of events in Persia.

It is significant for the interrelationship between general and Jewish history that Jews from Palestine seem also to have been aware of the new situation in the lands beyond the Euphrates and Tigris. They must have followed the trend of events in distant land quite closely because the opening of the relations between Persia and Europe, was also a signal for Palestinian Jews to open relations with the Jewish communities in Persia. It was at that time that Jewish messengers, Shelikhim, went out to visit their brethren in Persia. Simultaneously therefore, with the appearance in Persia of Christian travelers for religious purposes — Carmelites, Dominicans, Jesuits, Augustines, — and European merchants for economic and political reasons—Italians,

*Russia and Persia*, London 1885, pp. 146–147.) Not less fanatical was his successor Shah Ismael II (1576–77) who hesitated to issue new silver and gold coins on the ground that the coins could be handled also by non-believers such as Armenians, Jews, Indians, which had to be avoided since there were engraved on the coins the words: There is no God but Allah and Mohammed is his Prophet and Ali is the friend of Allah. (See W. Hinz: "Schah Ismail II" in *MSOS*, Berlin 1933, p. 83.)

<sup>23</sup> See L. Bouvat: *Essai sur les rapports de la Perse avec l'Europe* in *Revue du Monde Musulman*, Paris 1921, Vol. 46, pp. 23–62; also A. Siassi: *La Perse au contact de L'Occident*, Paris 1931; and K. Bayāni: *Les Relations de l'Iran avec l'Europe occidentale a l'époque Safavide*, Paris 1937.

Portuguese, Spaniards, Dutchmen, Frenchmen, British, and others — Jews from Palestine seized the first opportunity, though for other reasons, to create new ties between Jerusalem and the Persian diaspora. These Jewish messengers<sup>24</sup> did not seek interviews with kings or ministers; they did not ask for privileges or favors from the authorities; they did not look for official receptions or for diplomatic or economic advantages. Their aim was to foster the love for Zion, and to urge assistance for the charitable institutions in the Holy Land. Undoubtedly as a direct result of the new economic policy, also Jewish merchants from neighboring countries, especially from the Ottoman Empire, came to Persia to settle, strengthening already existing communities or establishing new ones. In the sources we find references to Jews from Aleppo, Tripoli, Baghdad, and Constantinople, some of whom settled down permanently in Persia.<sup>25</sup> We learn that Jews from Georgia, from the city of Zagrum, who helped Shah Abbas in his expedition against Turkey in 1613,

<sup>24</sup> Though the full history of the institution of the "shaliakh", the Jewish messenger, and his role as a spiritual and cultural link between the Jewish communities in Palestine and those in Asia and particularly in Persia, has not yet been written it is generally supposed that the first Jewish messenger to Persia from Palestine was Rabbi Moshe Alshai (1508–1600) from Safed, one of the great masters of the Talmud of his time, a preacher and teacher of outstanding qualities whose advice was sought from Jewish communities all over the East. But this tradition can hardly be substantiated from historical sources. See the studies of A. Yaari on "Shlikhim from Erez Israel" in *Sinai* 1940, III, No. 8–9, p. 170/178.

<sup>25</sup> About a Jewish family from Palestine who immigrated into Persia and settled there in this period see the interesting passage in Pietro della Valle's *Travels* l. c. ed. Pinkerton Vol. IX, p. 41. This Italian traveler met in Cazwin in 1618 a Jew of whom he said: "As I am ever desirous of forming acquaintances with the learned in the little time I remain here, I got introduced to a Jew, a native of Shiraz, whose family, however, came from Safed, at present a seminary of the most learned and most religious among the Jews in Palestine. His name was Mulla Messih, and he was brought to Cazwin by the king to practice physic (!) and he carries out this profession publicly, receiving persons at his house with great civility, but visiting none; where necessary, to send to the patient for his being too weak to come to consult him — he dispatches some ignorant servant and prescribes from his report of the symptoms without seeing the patient . . . He showed me his library which contained nothing curious . . ."



were enabled to settle on Persian soil and to establish a new city on the Caspian Sea, Farahabad, the City of Joy. It is probably to that period that the Judaeo-Persian chronicler refers when he states that "the epoch of Shah Abbas was the time of peace, when the wolves became the friends of the sheep, and when the Zoroastrians and non-believers, the Christians and the Jews, the Frenchmen and the Armenians, the Georgians and other strangers, lived in mutual harmony in the shadow of his throne."<sup>26</sup>

It can hardly be assumed that the immigration of Jews into Persia, be it as temporary visitors or as permanent settlers, was of any considerable size despite the encouraging attitude of Shah Abbas' policy towards the newcomers. We have no means of ascertaining the absolute and correct numbers of the Jewish population for any period in the history of Persia. Arab and Persian geographers of the first centuries of Islamic rule have given us merely some statements concerning the relative strength of Jews in some of the Persian provinces. Thus we are informed that in the province of Jibāl "Jews are more numerous than Christians"; that in Khorasan there are "many Jews and a few Christians"; that in the province of Khusistan "Christians are few and Jews are numerous"; while in the province of Fars, "the Zoroastrians are more numerous than the Jews and there are only a few Christians".<sup>27</sup> The figures given by Benjamin of Tudela in the 12th century concerning some Jewish communities in Persia seem to be too exaggerated to be taken as reliable.

The first more concrete estimates as to the numerical strength of Jews in Persia we obtain, however, only in this period of the

<sup>26</sup> See the Judaeo-Persian Chronicles of Babai b. Lutf and Babai b. Farhad, publ. in extracts by W. Bacher: *Les Juifs de la Perse au XVII et au XVIII Siècles*, Strassburg 1907; and the Armenian Chronicle of Arakel of Tabriz. The chapter on the Persian Jews in the Armenian Chronicle was published in Russian translation in *Jewr. Starina* Vol. X, Petersburg 1918, pp. 60-76. See also Abraham Galante in *Hamenora*, Istanbul 1935.

<sup>27</sup> Al-Mukaddasi: *Descriptio Imperii Moslemici* ed. de Goeje in *Bibl. Geog. Arab.*, Vol. III, Leyden 1906, pp. 394, 12; l. c. 323, 3; 414, 16; 439, 9; see also Istakhri l. c. p. 139, 12-17.

16th century. Pedro Teixeira (1580)<sup>28</sup> informs us that there are "some 8,000–10,000 families of Jews throughout all the provinces of Persia". That this figure apparently remained static for a whole century, we learn from the French traveler, J. Chardin (1670), who speaks of about "9,000–10,000 Jewish families" and in another passage he asserts that "there are about 30,000–35,000 Jews in Persia".<sup>29</sup>

How this number was divided amongst the various provinces cannot be determined, though we know from the Judaeo-Persian chronicles of Babai ibn Lutf and Babai ibn Farhad and from Armenian sources that Jews were distributed over more than 30 communities in Persia.<sup>30</sup> This is also confirmed by John Fryer,<sup>31</sup> who writes that "in all the cities of Persia there are abundance of the Jewish nation" and more specifically by Chardin, who says "this race of Jews is dispersed today in Media, in Hyrcania, in the land of the Parthes, in the two Caramaniens, *along the Persian Gulf* and in some other localities".<sup>32</sup>

In limiting our research to the region of the Persian Gulf we have now to investigate where exactly these Jewish settlements "along the Persian Gulf" were situated which have become so prominent in the time of the Safavid dynasty.

<sup>28</sup> The Travels of Pedro Teixeira (with his chronicle of the Kings of Ormuz) transl. and ed. by W. F. Sinclair with additional notes by D. W. Ferguson, in *Hakluyt Society Publications*, London 1901, p. 252. See also J. Stevens: *The History of Persia* . . . . extracted from Teixeira, London 1715, p. 392. About this Portuguese traveler of Jewish origin see M. Kayserling: Pedro Teixeira in J. J. Benjamin's II account of *Eight Years in Asia and Africa* (1846–1855) Hannover, 1859, pp. 1–6. Teixeira's book contains many valuable details about Jewish communities in Baghdad, Ana, Aleppo, etc., an indication of his continuous interest in his former co-religionists.

<sup>29</sup> *Voyages en Perse* ed. L. Langlès, Paris 1811, Vol. VI, pp. 132–136, Vol. X, p. 242.

<sup>30</sup> See Note 26 above and my study on "Jews in Persia in the Seventeenth Century" in *Zion* (Quarterly for Research in Jewish History) Jerusalem, 1937, Vol. II, p. 276 ff.

<sup>31</sup> John Fryer: *A New Account of East India and Persia* (1672–1681), ed. W. Crooke, *Hakluyt Publ. Society*, London 1902, Vol. II, p. 216. See also p. 350 and Vol. III, p. 36 and 125.

<sup>32</sup> Chardin: *Voyages*, ed. Amsterdam 1735, Vol. III, p. 426–428.

## 5

## GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION FROM THE 16TH CENTURY ON

The renewal in the 16th century of the link between the Persian Gulf and Jewish settlements is significantly connected with the city and island which began in these centuries to play the central role in the Indian-European trade, namely Hormuz or Ormuz. Just as Kish was supplanted by Katifa, so Katifa and all the other trading centers of the Persian Gulf in turn were superseded from the 14th century on by Ormuz. It became the most prominent center of Indian trade, the meeting place of the merchants of all European nations trading with India and the Far East, the rendezvous of *mercatores totius orbis*, among whom Jews were also mentioned.<sup>33</sup>

The Jewish settlement in *Ormuz* from the 16th century on is well attested, by Hebrew as well as by European sources. Probably for the first time in Hebrew literature it is mentioned in a Responsum<sup>34</sup> sent to Rabbi Moshe Alshaikh in connection with the visit to Ormuz (הורמזי) by a Jewish merchant, Yahuda Gabbay from Brusa (Turkey) (ברוסה), who entertained business connections with the Jews of the Persian Gulf. Ormuz is also mentioned in the "Sefer ha-Mussar" by the Yemenite Jew, traveler and poet, Zakharya ben Saadya az-Zahiri<sup>35</sup> who in the second half of the 16th century spent full six months in Ormuz

<sup>33</sup> There exist innumerable descriptions of Ormuz, but we need not enumerate them here. See Wilson, l. c. Bibliography.

<sup>34</sup> The Responsa of Moshe Alshaikh, ed. Venetia, 1605, paragraph 118. I owe this reference to my late friend, Dr. Alfred Freimann of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. A systematic search in the Responsa literature of the time will undoubtedly furnish further important data. The name of the city of Ormuz is also mentioned, as Prof. I. Baer kindly pointed out to me, in David ha-Reubeni's *Sippur*; but without any reference to a Jewish community in Ormuz. See the edition of A. S. Ashcoly, Jerusalem 1940, pp. 77 and 228. The correction of Formosa (פורמוס) into Ormus seems very likely, see Ashcoly l. c. p. 67, 230. See also A. Neubauer: *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles*, Oxford 1895, Vol. II, p. 173, p. 180.

<sup>35</sup> See the author's work entitled *Sefer ha-Mussar*, Chapter IX, still only available in manuscript. The author refers to Ormuz in ch. 4, 9 and 19 (הורמז). Cf. D. S. Sassoon: *Ohel David*, vol. ii, p. 1023-33 (No. 995); selected chapters have



(הורמון) and has left us a very vivid account of his visit and his sojourn there. It can hardly be assumed that at that time a Yemenite Jew would have spent any length of time in a place in which there was no Jewish community.

That there actually was a Jewish community in Ormuz at that time is reliably stated by the Portuguese traveler Pedro Teixeira, himself of Jewish origin. While studying the Persian language and the history of Persia in Ormuz (1593–1597), Pedro Teixeira had ample opportunity to acquaint himself with the population in this place. "The people of Ormuz," he writes, "all speak Persian . . . and all the natives are Moors . . . Besides there are many Christians, Portugueses, Armenians, Georgians, Jacobites, Nestorians, and many Heathens . . . and about one hundred and fifty houses of Jews."<sup>36</sup>

That this rather considerable Jewish community in Ormuz still existed a generation later is well confirmed by the Spanish envoy Garcias de Silva Figueroa<sup>37</sup> who visited Ormuz in 1617 and still found among the population of 2500–3000 families "about one hundred Jewish families." He also met there with a Jew by the name of Isaac, who functioned as "collecteur" on behalf of the government and who is described as one "who spoke very well his Hebrew language and who showed that he was very much acquainted with the Old Testament". This Jewish "collecteur", apart from speaking Persian, was also well versed in Spanish since he, together with others, had originally come from Aleppo, Tripoli, or Constantinople, and were descendants of Spanish Jews.<sup>38</sup>

been published by H. Brody in *Matmonei Mistarim* (Cracow 1894), pp. 9–11, 20–26; by Z. Kehaty in *Zion*, vol. iii (1929), 43–53; J. Schirman in *Yedioth ha-Machon le-Heker ha-Shirah* (Jerusalem 1936), p. 186, and by the present writer in *Tarbiz*, vol. vi, (1935), pp. 177–81 and *Sinai*, vol. iii (1940), p. 231, n. 26. Through the courtesy of Professor Alexander Marx and Mr. M. Lutzky I had been able to use the manuscript of *Sefer ha-Mussar* of the Jewish Theological Seminary Library, New York.

<sup>36</sup> See about his work Note 28 l. c. p. 168.

<sup>37</sup> *L'Ambassade de Don Garcia de Silva Figueroa en Perse*, translated from Spanish by A. de Wicqfort, Paris 1667, pp. 41–42.

<sup>38</sup> Figueroa l. c. p. 42. See also A. Olearius: *Voyage and Travels* London 1669, p. 165; O. Dapper: *Asia*, Nurenberg 1681, Vol. II, p. 56.

With the shifting of the economic center from the island of Ormuz to the mainland, *Bander Abbas*, formerly called Gambrou or Gambroon, became the seat of a Jewish settlement. Created by Shah Abbas I in 1622 in order to divert trade from Ormuz to the mainland of Persia and to foster the trade within Persia, Bander Abbas was destined to play a prominent role in international trade. It became the principal foothold of the English and Dutch East India Companies, which received there special privileges from the Shah. European visitors during the 17th century mention repeatedly the presence of Jews in Bander Abbas. Chardin,<sup>39</sup> the French traveler, counted "some fifty Jewish houses" in Bander Abbas. And the Judaeo-Persian chronicler, Babai ibn Lutf, presents Bander Abbas as a considerable Jewish community.<sup>40</sup>

The city of *Lar*, though not on the shores of the Persian Gulf but in its immediate vicinity, was another important seat of Jewish settlement. Lar was situated on the main caravan route which connected southern Persia with Bandar Abbas and other ports of the Persian Gulf and can be regarded as belonging economically and politically to the area of the Gulf. Lar is not mentioned by any of the earlier Arab geographers. Only in the 14th century the Persian geographer Mustawfi refers to Lar as the name of a district by the sea, whose population consisted mainly of merchants who were given to sea voyages. It became a mint city under the Timurid rulers, thus indicating that it was then a place of some size and importance. The Khan of Lar was once paramount to the kings of Ormuz, but during the period of Portuguese supremacy this position became reversed. With the conquest of Ormuz by d'Albuquerque, the tribute from Ormuz to Lar had been suspended, but now the ruler of Lar advanced his claim for arrears.<sup>41</sup>

Lar must have had a Jewish community already in the 16th century, and in view of its commercial prominence seems to have attracted Jewish settlers from other parts of Persia. One

<sup>39</sup> *Voyages* . . . Amsterdam, Vol. III, p. 224.

<sup>40</sup> See W. Bacher: *Les Juifs de la Perse* . . . l. c. pp. 46-50; pp. 78, 88.

<sup>41</sup> See G. Le Strange: *The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate*, Cambridge 1905, p. 291; L. Lockhart: *Nadir Shah*, London 1938, p. 6; V. Minorsky l. c. p. 17 note.

of the first documentary evidences of the presence of the Jewish community in Lar is supplied again by a Portuguese traveler of Jewish origin, Antonio Tenreiro (1560). Tenreiro, the first European to cross the desert from Aleppo to Basra, who rightly can be regarded as one of the earliest of a long line of Spanish and Portuguese travelers who visited Persia, Mesopotamia, and other lands in an official diplomatic capacity, has given considerable attention to the Jewish life in most of the places visited by him. His "Itinerario" furnishes us with very valuable details. He refers to "Judeus Arabios" in Basra, to "Mercadores Venecianos Judeus", to "Judeus Hespanol que era fisico of Abraham Baxa (Pasha)". Nor did he fail to notice the presence of Jews in Lar, about whom he had to say, "Habitao nesta cidade alguna Judeus Persianos gente pobre naturaes de mesme terra".<sup>42</sup>

Another early European source which attests to the existence of Jews in Lar is the report of John Newbury, a London citizen, the first Englishman to visit Ormuz (1579). After his visit to Ormuz, Newbury traveled along the coast of the Persian Gulf, disembarking at Gombroon (the later Bander Abbas), and then proceeded to Lar (1581). It was here that he engaged a local Jew as his servant and interpreter, who travelled with him the road to Shiras and Isfahan. In his own words he states, "The fifteenth day I hired (in Lar) Mousa, a Jew, for six months to be my servant for 30 larins the month . . ." This Jew Mousa was undoubtedly a resident member of the community of Lar.<sup>43</sup>

In the 17th century, Lar had become one of the leading communities in Persia, and many European travelers refer to its Jewish inhabitants. Figueroa (1617) visited them in their quarter.<sup>44</sup> Thomas Herbert (1628) was not too much impressed by them and condemned the violent heat and the diseases among them.<sup>45</sup>

<sup>42</sup> A. Tenreiro: *Itinerario*, Lisbon 1560; new ed. by A. Bairo 1923, p. 360. No translation seems to be available of that travel book.

<sup>43</sup> About him see *Purchas, His Pilgrims*, Vol. VIII, p. 640; W. Foster: *England's Quest for Eastern Trade*, London 1933, p. 84; S. C. Chew: *The Crescent and the Rose*, New York 1937, pp. 205-223.

<sup>44</sup> *L'Ambassade . . .* l. c. pp. 75-76.

<sup>45</sup> *Travels of Sir Thomas Herbert* ed. W. Foster (Broadway Traveler) London 1928, pp. 54, 60. See his remarks on Jews of Jahrun in the vicinity of



Thévenot (1663–1666), the French traveler, provides us with some hints as to their numerical strength, stating that the Jews are even more numerous in Lar than in Shiraz; they have a quarter to themselves near the hill on which the castle stands.<sup>46</sup> When Tavernier (1668) visited Lar, he got the impression in view of the size of the Jewish community there, that “the store of the Jewish nation that have passed into Persia settled in Isfahan and Lar”.<sup>47</sup> Also the frequent reference in the chronicle of Babai ibn Lutf to the Jews of Lar allow us to draw the conclusion that Lar was indeed an economic and, as we shall see further, a cultural and political center in the 17th century.<sup>48</sup>

It was at that time also that *Muscat*, which was the leading port in the Gulf of Oman and commanded the entrance into the Persian Gulf, renewed its Jewish settlement. Figueroa, who visited the place in 1617 found there “about fifteen or twenty Jewish families all poor and miserable”.<sup>49</sup> Being one of the hottest cities in the world, Muscat was not visited by many Europeans. But records, though scanty, attest the continuous existence of a Jewish settlement there as late as the 19th century. Niebuhr found in 1765 a small colony of Jews, the head of which he called “Sheikh of the Jews”.<sup>50</sup>

About 1820 “few Jews and no Christians” are stated to have been in Muscat. But the Muscat Jewish community seemed to have received an influx of Jewish settlers in the early part of the 19th century from Baghdad, according to Wellsted,<sup>51</sup> as a result of the oppression of the Baghdadian Jews by the Ottoman Pasha Daud. The famous Jewish traveler Rabbi David d’Beth Hillel found in 1828, probably before the new wave of immigrants

Lar; cf. Hasan i Rumli: *A Chronicle of the early Sefavids*, ed. and transl. by C. N. Seddon, 1934, p. xiv.

<sup>46</sup> Jean de Thevenot: *Relation d'un voyage*, Paris 1674, p. 411.

<sup>47</sup> I. B. Tavernier: *Les six voyages* Paris 1681, Vol. II, p. 137. See also Bernier: *Travels in the Mogul Empire* (1656–1668) p. 431. “It is certain that many Jews are settled in Persia at Lara . . .”

<sup>48</sup> W. Bacher l. c. pp. 48, 93, 98. Lar and Bander Abbas are always mentioned together in the chronicle.

<sup>49</sup> *L'Ambassade* . . . l. c. pp. 19, 55.

<sup>50</sup> *Description de l'Arabie*, 1774, Vol. II, p. 85.

<sup>51</sup> J. R. Wellsted: *Travels in Arabia*, (London 1838), Vol. I, p. 15, pp. 21–22.

from Baghdad, only four Jewish families and a small synagogue. He speaks very highly of the Sultan of Muscat, who "is a very excellent, fine, and charitable man to all the nations, particularly to the Israelites, whom he calls 'Vlad Sara' (the children of Sara)".<sup>52</sup>

## 6

## THE ECONOMIC STRUCTURE

It seems that the Jews of the Persian Gulf region shared the occupational stratification with the rest of their co-religionists in Persia. Like the Jews in other parts of Persia, they too were active in many branches of trade and handicraft. They were millers, weavers, dyers, tailors, shop-keepers, goldsmiths, agents in small businesses, and brokers but they were not active in money-lending, a profession engaged in by Indians. The manufacturing of wine, not being permitted to the Mohammedans, was one of their monopolies, in Shiraz as well as in Muscat and elsewhere.<sup>53</sup> This was not only a source of income but also a steady source of trouble and conflict. In the trade with drugs and spices, with antiquities and jewelry, and with textiles of all sorts, Persian Jews had attained fame and prominence. The great variety of attractive merchandise exhibited by the Jews in

<sup>52</sup> See *Travels of R. David d'beth Hillel*, Madras 1832, pp. 110-116. See the present writer's study: "The Jews of Kurdistan," above Note 4. There was also a Jewish community in Sohar in the territory of Oman. In 1848 Benjamin II met in Mascatt only one Jew, Haji Ezekiel, originally from Baghdad, who for eleven years had functioned as English consul there. He is "the only Jew in Mascatt with the exception of his black household whom he has converted to Mosaism". Benjamin II met some Jews in the places adjacent to Muscat amongst which Sohar is mentioned. (Benjamin II: *Eight years* . . . p. 179.)

<sup>53</sup> All our sources give ample evidence of this economic structure of Persian Jews. See Fryer l. c. Vol. II, p. 247. Raphael du Mans: *Estat de la Perse 1660* ed. Schefer, Paris 1890, pp. 193-194. Cornelius de Bruin: *Travels into Muscovy, Persia* (1737), London 1890, Vol. II, p. 46. "There are about 700 poor Jewish families in Shiraz; they inhabit a particular quarter and are wine dressers for the generality". Figueroa l. c. p. 19; Tavernier l. c. p. 304/305. Wellsted l. c. p. 22, "Their avocations in Maskat are various, many being employed in the fabrication of silver ornaments, other in shroffing money and some few retail intoxicating liquors."

the bazars of Isfahan, the capital of the Persian empire at that time, had become the object of praise by many European visitors.<sup>54</sup> Another typical "Jewish" occupation at that time was that of "entertainer" at the courts of the nobles; as professional dancing boys, musicians, flutists, singers, Jews performed a strange task at official banquets.<sup>55</sup> Jewish women also are reported to have participated actively in the economic life; they acted as midwives, and as consultants to the ladies in the harem, giving recipes for love potions and magic concoctions, telling fortunes for which they received high remuneration.<sup>56</sup>

Jews participated also in the manufacturing of that article which was most in demand by the merchants of Europe (and particularly of England) who came to Persia at that time — namely, silk. Silk, the oil of that time, was the attraction for the various trade companies which were organized then.<sup>57</sup> Persian silk, produced mainly in the northern provinces of Gilan and

<sup>54</sup> See Th. Herbert l. c. p. 234; Tavernier l. c. p. 153; Fryer, l. c. Vol. II, p. 247; Ogilby, l. c. p. 9, p. 20.

<sup>55</sup> Until late in the nineteenth century Jews did function in such capacity as "entertainers". See E. G. Browne: *A Year Amongst the Persians*, London, 1893, pp. 241, 243, 320/323.

<sup>56</sup> J. Chardin, Vol. VI, p. 27, p. 132. "Leurs femmes (juives) se glissant dans les serails font accroître aux sottises et simples créatures qui y gouvernent par les charmes de leur beauté, qu'ils savent prédire l'avenir et qu'ils leur prédirent ce qui leur arrivera qu'ils composent des breuvages pour se faire aimer, pour faire haïr leurs rivales, pour faire avoir des enfants et pour empêcher d'en avoir; et par telles et semblables illusions, ils se font bien payer."

It might be of interest to quote the following passage of the Dutch traveler Th. Salmon: *Historie und Geographie des Gegenwaertigen Staat in Persien* 1739 p. 262. "Die Benjanen (Indians) in Persien uebertreffen die Juden wie im Schacher so auch in der Anzahl; sie haben den Geldwechsel von ganz Persien in Haenden and haben die Juden beinahe von allen Pacht, Wechsel und Negotio verdraengt, so dass diese in Persien einen armen and verachteten Haufen ausmachen; weil sie bei der Handlung nun nichts verdienen koennen, so legen sie sich auf Wahrsagen und allerlei solche schwarz geachtete Kuenste; sonderlich suchen ihre Frauen sich im Harem damit einzuschleichen und fuernehmlich mit Liebestraencken wollen sie den armen Weibern gern beistehen, ihnen die Gunst derer . . . zu erwecken und zu erhalten . . ."

<sup>57</sup> See Chardin l. c. Vol III, pp. 1-3: La Grande marchandise de Perse est la Soye . . . . See V. Minorsky: *A Manuel of Safavid Administration in Journal of Central Asian Society*, London 1944, p. 97.



Mazandaran became the playball in the political activities of European, mostly English, trade concerns, organized in the Muscovy Company, the Levant Company, and, last, not least, in the East India Company.<sup>58</sup> It can be assumed that the struggle for the trade routes and the efforts of the East India Company to transfer the "silk route" from Gilan and the Caspian Sea over Aleppo and then across the Mediterranean to a new route via Isfahan, Siraf, Lar, to the port of the Persian Gulf, Bander Abbas and then by sea to England, must have affected the commercial interests of all groups concerned, Armenians, Jews and others who were active in the silk trade. It is this which might explain somehow the "sudden appearance", or the growth, of the Jewish settlements along the shores of the Persian Gulf.

We are informed that in Mazandaran "silk is fabricated by a society of Jews", that in Shiraz "Jews are manufacturing stuffs of gold and silk",<sup>59</sup> that the Jews of Isfahan used to bring "very fine woolen thither from Tabriz",<sup>60</sup> and the Jews of Lar were "famous for the manufacturing of silk and especially of silk girdles".<sup>61</sup>

How far the Jews participated in the external over-sea trade of the 17th century cannot yet be established. According to Tavernier, only the Armenians were the bearers of the foreign trade, "negoze étranger", while the Jews and Persians were dealing with the internal trade. Though it is evident from the sources that the main agents and factors of the East India Company were Armenians residing in Persia, helping to increase and to explore new markets for the British-Persian trade, there are enough indications to show that Jews, too, in the region of the Persian Gulf and elsewhere were engaged in oversea trade

<sup>58</sup> On the Levant Company see the excellent study of Alfred C. Wood: *A History of the Levant Company*, Oxford 1935; concerning the employment of Jews by the Company see pp. 115, 155-256; 214-218. On the English East India Company whose main stations were in Isfahan, Basra and Bander Abbas, see Sh. A. Khan: *The East India Trade in the XVIIIth Century*, Oxford 1923, p. 249 ff. On the Muscovy Company see Jonas Hanway: *An Historical Account of the British Trade Over the Caspian Sea*, Dublin 1754, Vol. I, p. 399 ff.

<sup>59</sup> Cornelius de Bruin l. c. Vol. II, p. 46.

<sup>60</sup> A. Olearius: *Voyages and Travels*, 1669, p. 165; also J. Ogilby: *A Description of Persia*, London 1673, p. 9 ff.

<sup>61</sup> Tavernier: *Voyages en Perse . . .*, p. 239, 259.

and commerce. Persian Jews were to be found not only in the sea-bound Mediterranean commerce and in Constantinople,<sup>62</sup> Baghdad, and Aleppo, but also in the sea-bound Persian-Indian trade. It is probably not accidental that the Italian traveler Pietro della Valle met on the boat from India a Jewish merchant "who had lately dwelt in Ormuz and came to Sindi by sea", who obviously undertook many commercial journeys. He must have been well acquainted with the political and economic conditions of the countries from where he brought his merchandise, and the Italian traveler calls him "a sagacious person".<sup>63</sup>

The role of Jews in the oversea trade of the Persian Gulf area is furthermore well attested by Figueroa. This very keen observer, in describing the attack of the joint English-Persian forces against the Portuguese in Ormuz, states that the attack on Ormuz came so much as a surprise that the Portuguese had no time "to transfer the enormous quantity of merchandise of which Ormuz was full and which belonged to rich merchants such as Banians, Indians, not to speak of those which belonged to the Portuguese, Arab or Jewish merchants".<sup>64</sup> That the Jews were well-known as a factor in the Orient trade is clearly indicated in a report of A. de Gouvea who visited Persia on behalf of Spain and had an interview with Shah Abbas I in Meshhed, in 1602. The Shah, in assuring this Spanish envoy freedom for all merchants of all religions, was obviously aware of the presence of Jews and their participation in the commerce in Ormuz, since he promised that "he will see to it that all merchants, Christians, Moors, Jews, and Gentiles (Indians) can freely and unhampered go to Ormuz".<sup>65</sup>

<sup>62</sup> See Hans Dernschwam's: *Tagebuch (1553-1554)* in extracts in *MGWJ*, p. 109 ff. It is of interest to note that amongst prisoners taken to Malta and Venice were also Persian Jews. See Cecil Roth: *Jews of Malta (Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society)* London 1931, Vol. XII, p. 203 ff.

<sup>63</sup> The Travels of Pietro della Valle in India (1622) ed. E. Grey in *Hakluyt Society Pub.* London 1891, Vol. II, p. 401.

<sup>64</sup> Figueroa l. c. p. 465-468. See also C. Bayani, l. c. p. 79.

<sup>65</sup> Antoine de Gouvea: *Histoire Orientale des Grands progres de l'Eglise Catholic*, Anvers 1609, pp. 716-717; and the same author's *Relation des grandes guerres et victoires obtenues par Cha Abbas*, Rouen 1646, pp. 56-59.

In this Orient trade not only Persian Jews but also those from other countries actively participated. It is to be noted that at that time Turkish Jews from Brusa in Asia Minor had commercial dealings in silk with Ormuz, and it is even stated that they were the first to introduce into Turkey the silk worm.<sup>66</sup> The Responsa collection of R. Moshe Alshaikh has preserved a very illuminating report on a certain Yahuda Gabbai from Brusa who visited Ormuz for business purposes, probably in connection with the silk trade, and who returned via Shiras where he was assassinated because he refused to travel with a caravan on the Sabbath.

In this connection mention ought to be made of particular difficulties which Jewish merchants encountered in their trade journeys. The travel and transportation difficulties of the 16th and 17th centuries prevented the merchant from traveling by himself. For reasons of security alone a merchant who intended to embark on a long overland journey through deserts and across hostile and dangerous territories had to join a caravan, which guaranteed a great degree of protection and safety. For Jewish merchants who adhered to the traditional observance of the Sabbath and who refused to travel on this day the joining of the caravan presented added difficulties. European travelers to the Near and Middle East refer repeatedly to this peculiar problem. "Whenever a large group of Jews crossed the desert with one of the merchant caravans, they insisted in resting upon their Sabbath. If they could not bribe a caravan leader to camp for most of that day, they would pay for the services of a guide or even of an escorting guard, in order that they might ride on ahead of the main body of the caravan the day before, or else rest first, and then catch up with it again the day after their Sabbath".<sup>67</sup>

Pedro Teixeira had occasion during his travels to report again and again "we had in advance certain Jews of the caravan with an Arab whom in such case the captain used to give them for escort in return for certain services due at the end of the trip. These go ahead that they may rest on their Sabbath, when they

<sup>66</sup> On Brusa see *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Vol. II pp. 1114–1115. See also Niebuhr, Vol. III, p. 141–145 on Brusa's silk trade in 1767.

<sup>67</sup> See C. P. Grant: *The Syrian Desert*, New York 1938, p. 83, p. 353.



may not march, without falling in rear of the caravan". Or "... we marched again leaving the Jews behind, for that next day was their Sabbath", Travelers of the 18th century also report this custom. In a narrative of a journey from Aleppo to Basra in 1745 to 1751 it is stated: "This being the Jewish Sabbath, those belonging to our caravan remained behind in obedience to the Mosaic law which prohibits their traveling more than a stated distance on that day. This they had always observed, ever since we left Aleppo, commonly rejoining us in the night. They, therefore, on our setting out, requested the Sheikh to allow them a guard to stay with them, till the expiration of the Sabbath and to escort them to the caravan. . . ." <sup>68</sup>

How dangerous and fateful sometimes this practice could be we learn from the Hebrew responsa to which we referred earlier according to which the Jewish merchant Yahuda Gabbai from Brusa, having remained behind the caravan because of the Sabbath, was assassinated by Persians on his way back from Ormuz between Shiraz and Isfahan.

## 7

## THE CULTURAL ASPECT

One of the strange phenomena in Persia's historical development is the steady shifting of political and cultural centers. Under each dynasty and even during the lifetime of one dynasty, the residence of the ruler changed and with it also the literary or cultural center of the respective period.

In the historical development of Persian Jewry we observe a similar shifting of cultural centers. While in the time of Benjamin of Tudela, in the 12th century, the center was Isfahan — the seat of the largest Jewish community in Persia and the residence of its chief Rabbi, appointed by the authority in Baghdad, the

<sup>68</sup> Cf. Pedro Teixeira l. c., p. 39, p. 44. William Beawes: Narrative of a Journey from Aleppo to Basra in 1745 and J. A. Carmichael: A Journey from Aleppo to Basra in 1751, in *Hakylut Society Publ.*, London 1929, pp. 13, 172-173.

Gaon or Exilarch — under the Il-Khan rulers in the 13th and 14th century, this role was taken over by Tabriz and probably Shiraz. Under the Safavid dynasty Kashan seemed to have been the cultural center, the "Little Jerusalem" as it was called, the meeting-place of Jewish scholars and Rabbis, although along with Kashan, previous centers such as Shiraz, Isfahan and Hamadan continued somehow the glory of their past. At the same time, also, the new concentration of Jewish settlements along the Persian Gulf is probably responsible for the rise of a new cultural center in that region, namely in *Lar*.

European visitors to the Persian Gulf region were not impressed by the cultural and spiritual level of the Jewish settlements. Figueroa calls the Jews of Ormuz, "Jews only by name. They do not know any Hebrew and have no knowledge at all of the Jewish religion though they still observe some ceremonies of the ancient law, but so much changed through the mixture with the ceremonies taken from the Maures and the heathens that they are not any more recognizable".<sup>69</sup> He refers to the Jews of Muscat as "poor and miserable and so little educated that one could say about them that they are only Jews by name".<sup>70</sup> Chardin condemns the Jews of all Persia "as being the most ignorant of all the world".<sup>71</sup> These and similar statements however can hardly be taken as an objective description. Most of these travelers could hardly penetrate behind the walls of the Jewish quarter and of Jewish life, and most likely due to their short stay were prevented from looking deeper into the cultural structure and conditions of the Jewish community.

Yet the Jews of that region were far from being so illiterate and uneducated as some observers would lead us to believe. From a thorough study of the remnants and fragments of the Judaeo-Persian literature so far available and accessible, the rather striking and so far unnoticed feature reveals itself that Persian Gulf Jewry had in the City of Lar a cultural and literary center of their own.

The first indication of the literary activity of Jews in Lar

<sup>69</sup> Figueroa l. c. p. 42.

<sup>70</sup> l. c. p. 19.

<sup>71</sup> Chardin, l. c. Vol. VI, p. 136.

comes from a Jewish poet by the name of Yahuda, who, according to his birthplace, was known as Yahuda Lari and lived in the early sixteenth century. His poem, "Kitāb Mahzan al-Pand", ("Treasure-house of exhortation") of which 151 verses have been preserved, reveals that he was a late successor of the Jewish Persian poets Shahin and Imrani of Shiraz, and, like them, a Jewish epigone of the great Persian poet Sa'di.<sup>72</sup>

Lar was not only the seat of a Jewish poet but must have been also the seat of a school of scribes, translators, and copyists who devoted themselves with great zeal to the cultivation of Jewish traditional values and to the task of translating or copying books of the Holy Scripture into the Persian language — which was written, however, in Hebrew characters. A survey of the Judaeo-Persian Bible manuscripts, many of which are housed today in the libraries of Paris, the Vatican, the British Museum, Petersburg, New York etc., shows that not a few of them originated in Lar in the first decade of the seventeenth century.<sup>73</sup>

It is particularly to the Florentine Jesuit, diplomat and traveler, Giambattista Vechiete (1552–1619) that Jewish history is deeply indebted for rescuing some of these manuscripts and bringing them to Europe. This Vechiete went toward the end of the 16th century (1584) to the East on a diplomatic mission on behalf of Pope Gregory XIII, entrusted with the double mission to conciliate the Patriarch of Alexandria and to enlist the assistance of the Persians in the Pope's fight against the Turks. Unlike other envoys and diplomats of that time, Vechiete combined with the pursuit of his diplomatic missions a great interest in old manuscripts and versions of the Bible. And while other travelers and visitors to Persia after their return to their

<sup>72</sup> See W. Bacher: Aus einem Juedisch-Persischen Lehrgedicht in *Keleti Szemle (Revue Orientale)* Budapest, 1911, pp. 223–228; also *ZDMG*, Vol. 65, pp. 531; D. S. Sassoon: *Ohel David*, Vol. I, p. 473b.

<sup>73</sup> The whole field of Judaeo-Persian literature has been surveyed in my study "Israel in Iran, A Survey of Judaeo-Persian Literature," in "*Jews and Judaism*" ed. L. Finkelstein, New York, 1949. See, also, S. Munk: *Notice sur Rabbi Saadia Gaon et sa Version Arabe D'Isaie*, Paris 1838, pp. 83–86; H. Zotenberg: *Catalogue des Manuscrits Hébreux de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris*, 1866; E. Blochet: *Catalogue des Mss. Persans*, Paris 1905; Ch. Adler: *Bibelkritische Reise nach Rom* (Altona 1783), p. 132.



European masters published reports and books on what they had seen and done in far-off lands in fulfilment of their specific missions, Vechiete, in addition to this, thanks to his keen scholarly interest, brought back to Europe old manuscripts of the Bible from the very lands and peoples that he visited. It is expressly stated that in 1601 he commenced a Persian translation of the Psalms and other books of the Bible in Ormuz and that after a second visit to Persia in 1605, Vechiete submitted to the Pope two volumes containing Bible translations into Judaeo-Persian, among them the Pentateuch, Psalms, the Book of Solomon and others, of which some were written in Lar.<sup>74</sup>

It can hardly be accidental that Lar is given as the geographical origin of these manuscripts; Lar must have been at that time a considerable cultural center. In view of this importance of Lar, the visit of a Rabbi Juda, from Galilea — perhaps a messenger, a Shaliakh from Zion — to Lar at the beginning of the 17th century receives now its proper meaning. "There are few remarkable things in the city (Lar)" — reports the Spanish envoy and traveler, A. de Gouvea,<sup>75</sup> in the year 1607 — "everyone comes to see us as a novelty, among them a Jewish rabbi called Juda who spoke Spanish . . . though he was born in Galilea. He said that his grandparents were natives of the Kingdom of Leon and that when the Jews were expelled from Spain they went to Galilea where they still until today speak the Spanish language . . . He was very much versed in the humanities (lettres humaines) and he entered in a discussion with me on several questions . . . on some passages in the Old Testament which he very well understood". It seems that the visit of a Jewish scholar from Palestine was not an accidental one but was most likely connected with Lar's position, not only as a prosperous economic center but as a Jewish cultural center at that time.

<sup>74</sup> G. B. Vechiete: A report on the conditions of Persia in the year 1586 (trans. to English by H. F. Brown) in *English Historical Review* 1892, pp. 314–321. See about him Edward Maclagan: *The Jesuits and the Great Mogul*, London 1932, pp. 211–214 and the notes there, pp. 219–220, and my forthcoming study "G. B. Vechiete — the first collector of Judeo-Persian Bible Manuscripts".

<sup>75</sup> L. c. pp. 56–59.

## 8

## DECLINE OF THE JEWISH SETTLEMENTS

The termination of Judaeo-Persian literary activities in Lar as well as in other centers seemed to have been caused by a change in the political situation. Lar, the Jewish cultural outpost of the Persian Gulf Region, became namely a storm center and the starting point of a movement which transformed years of peace and prosperity enjoyed by the Jewish-Persian communities into years, and even decades, of great oppression and persecution towards the middle of the seventeenth century. It was in Lar that internal strife, jealousy, and disharmony within the Jewish community brought the whole Persian Jewry to the very brink of catastrophe. A Jewish renegade, Mulla Abu'l Hassan Lari, once a leader of his community in Lar, turned Muslim, denounced his former co-religionists and succeeded with the help of Shiite dignitaries to enforce upon them the wearing of a special Jewish headgear as a sign of discrimination and humiliation.<sup>76</sup> Lari's crusade against his former co-religionists was only the prelude to much greater hardship and persecution for the Jews of Persia at that time<sup>77</sup>—a tragic chapter which cannot be discussed in this connection.<sup>78</sup>

<sup>76</sup> When John Fryer visited Lar in 1676 he observed that "the Jews of Lar are only recognizable by the upper garment marked with a patch of cloth of different color," l. c.

<sup>77</sup> Of the many documentary references to these events attention is directed to "History of the Mission of the Fathers of the Society of Jesus established in Persia" (Paris 1659) by the Rev. Father Alexander of Rhodes, parts of which have been translated and published by A. T. Wilson in p. 675/705. *Bull. of School of Oriental Studies*, London 1923-25, Vol. III. See pp. 695-697, chapter XVI "The Jews in Persia compelled to become Mohammedans and the Christians delivered from the fear of a like evil." See the present writer's forthcoming book on "History of the Jews in Persia."

<sup>78</sup> After the completion of this study new source-material on the Jewish settlement in Ormuz became accessible to me, mainly hitherto unpublished documents from Jesuit and Carmelite archives, which enrich considerably our knowledge of this community and its religious and cultural life.

The new material will soon be published.

## JEWISH SCRIBES IN MEDIEVAL ITALY

By AARON FREIMANN

"The craft of the scribe, ever favored by the Jewish law, prospered especially in the Middle Ages. Excellence which others achieved by division of labor, by the development of special guilds, parchment makers, scribes, gilders and illuminators, was here facilitated and furthered by a tradition of handicraft preserved and advanced in the same family, and by devout dedication to an art pursued for the sake of religion. The tanner's secrets of parchment making, the proper skill of hand and penmanship for the ductus of the letters, trusted recipes for the preparation of suitable inks and dyes of undimming brightness, all were handed down and propagated, by word of mouth and in writing, from generation to generation. No other manual art promised such enduring reward in posterity."<sup>1</sup>

"In Italy Jewish residency is counted by millenniums, and since five or six centuries it became the haven for refugees and exiles from France, Germany, Switzerland and Spain. Here, therefore, more than in the neighboring lands, Hebrew manuscripts were accumulated. Beginning with the sixteenth century, many manuscripts became the property of collectors and public libraries. Italy's possessions alone are estimated to amount to at least three thousand manuscripts".<sup>2</sup>

"In Italy Jewish learning always found devoted patrons and zealous adherents who either produced books themselves, or else ordered copyists to reproduce for them books written by others."<sup>3</sup>

In more recent times, thousands of manuscripts made in Italy found their way from private collections in Italy to the libraries of America, England, Germany, France and Palestine.

<sup>1</sup> David Kaufmann, *Gesammelte Schriften* III, 214.

<sup>2</sup> Zunz, *Gesammelte Schriften* III, 2.

<sup>3</sup> A. Berliner, *Gesammelte Schriften* I, 5.



Rome had already in days of antiquity schools in which the proficiency of writing was practised. The designation *γραμματεὺς* (a literal translation of the Hebrew סופר) occurs in 25 catacomb inscriptions in Rome.<sup>4</sup> Frey is of the opinion that the *γραμματεὺς* was not an expert in Jewish jurisprudence or *halakha*, as suggested by Schürer,<sup>5</sup> nor a scribe who copied scrolls of the Law for the use of the synagogue or prepared marriage certificates, bills of divorce etc., as maintained by Vogelstein and Rieger,<sup>6</sup> but rather a functionary of the community, the secretary, registrar and keeper of records.

I incline to the opinion that there existed in Rome schools for scribes, since in inscriptions *γραμματεὺς* is used of children who were trained for the profession of the scribe.

In the Middle Ages the status of the scribes in Rome was highly esteemed. "Men of noblest families devoted themselves to this calling. The Roman scribes in the thirteenth century whose names are preserved, were throughout educated men of letters, as can be seen from the postscripts which were often composed in poetical form. Some distinguished themselves as authors of independent works. All that proves sufficiently the importance and high regard enjoyed by the vocation of the scribes."<sup>7</sup>

What was said of Rome applies, on a smaller scale, also to Florence. The manuscripts here produced evince the influence of the art of scribes and illuminators then flowering in Toscana.<sup>8</sup> Striking is especially the large number of learned scribes among the copyists in Italy. Several of them are known as scholars whose works survived, and some were physicians, not counting such as claim physicians as their forbears.

Furthermore, it is a matter of record that in the second half of the fifteenth century, when printing just started, several scribes turned to the new art, although they simultaneously

<sup>4</sup> J. B. Frey, *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaicarum*, Rome 1936, p. XCII ff.

<sup>5</sup> Schürer, *Gemeindeverfassung* p. 30.

<sup>6</sup> *Geschichte der Juden in Rom* I, 47.

<sup>7</sup> *ibid.* I, 277.

<sup>8</sup> Il. Cassuto, *Firenze* p. 187-92, and Index: *Manoscritti ebraici* p. 442.

continued in their old craft. For example, the Conats in Mantua were still active as scribes even after they had entered the business of book printing.

. . . . .

This study about scribes of Hebrew works in Italy continues my earlier efforts on Jewish scribes in medieval Germany<sup>9</sup> and on copyists of Hebrew manuscripts in Spain and Portugal.<sup>10</sup> My friend Alexander Marx has shown interest in these investigations by writing himself additions to them.<sup>11</sup> May the present study which comes to honor a friend now for more than fifty years on his seventieth birthday, be also welcome to him.

### LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- Blondheim, Liste: D. S. Blondheim, Liste des manuscrits de Commentaires bibliques de Raschi in: *Revue des études juives*, tome 91 (1931) p. 71 sq. et 155 sq. Reprinted: Paris 1932: Publications de la Société des Etudes Juives.
- C. B.: M. Steinschneider, *Catalogus librorum Hebraeorum in Bibliotheca Bodleiana* Berlin 1852–60.
- Cassuto, Firenze: U. Cassuto, *Gli Ebrei a Firenze nell' età del rinascimento*. Firenze 1918: Pubblicazioni del R. Istituto di Studi Superiori Pratici e di Perfezionamento in Firenze. Sezione di filosofia e filologia.
- cod. Adler: E. N. Adler, *Catalogue of Hebrew Manuscripts in the collection of Elkan Adler*. Cambridge 1931.
- cod. Alliance: M. Schwab, *Les Manuscrits et incunables Hébreux de la Bibliothèque de L'Alliance Israélite* in: *Revue des études juives* tome 49 (1904) pp. 74 sq. et 270 sq.
- cod. Almanzi: S. D. Luzzatto, יד יוסף *Catalogue de la bibliothèque de littérature hébraïque et orientale de feu Josef Almanzi*. Padoue 1864.

<sup>9</sup> "Deutsche Abschreiber und Punktatoren des Mittelalters", in: *Zeitschrift für hebräische Bibliographie* 1907, v. 11, p. 86–96.

<sup>10</sup> "Kopisten hebräischer Handschriften in Spanien und Portugal", *ibid.* 1910, v. 14, p. 105–112.

<sup>11</sup> *ibid.* v. 14, p. 31; v. 15, p. 26–27, 95.

- cod. Ambrosiana: C. Bernheimer, *Codices hebraici Bibliothecae Ambrosianae*. Florentiae 1933.
- cod. Angelica: Angelo di Capua, *Catalogo dei codici ebraici della Biblioteca Angelica*. Firenze 1878. (Cataloghi dei codici orientali 1.)
- cod. Asher: LXXXVI Verzeichniss Hebräischer Handschriften und seltener Drucke aus dem antiquarischen Lager von A. Asher & Co. Berlin 1868 [I. Handschriften (verzeichnet von Dr. Steinschneider)].
- cod. Benzian: *Catalogue d'une précieuse collection hébraïque de Manuscrits, Incunables et de livres rares et importants en vente chez Julius Benzian*. Berlin 1869 [1872]. [Le catalogue des Manuscrits est rédigé par M. Steinschneider].
- cod. Berlin: M. Steinschneider, *Verzeichniss der hebräischen Handschriften*. 1.2. Berlin 1878.1897.
- cod. Beth ha-Midrash (London): Ad. Neubauer, *Catalogue of the Hebrew manuscripts in the Jews' College*, London. Oxford 1886.
- cod. Bisliches: L. Zunz, הפליט *Katalog wertvoller hebr. Handschriften*. Berlin 1850 [Hebrew]
- cod. Bologna: L. Modona, *Catalogo dei codici ebraici della biblioteca della R. Università di Bologna*. Firenze 1888. (Cataloghi dei codici orientali 4)
- cod. Br. Mus.: G. Margoliouth, *Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan Manuscripts in the British Museum* 1-3. London 1899-1915.
- cod. Cambridge: S. M. Schiller-Szinessy, *Catalogue of the Hebrew Mss. preserved in the University Library*, Cambridge 1. Cambridge 1876.
- cod. Casanata: G. Sacerdote, *Catalogo dei codici ebraici della biblioteca Casanatense*. Firenze 1897. (Cataloghi dei codici orientali. 6).
- cod. Coronel: N. Coronel, רשימה מספרי כתיבת יד *Catalogue of an important collection of Hebrew manuscripts*. London 1871.
- cod. de l'Ecole Rabbinique de France: M. Abraham, *Catalogue des manuscrits et incunables de l'Ecole rabbinique de France*. Paris 1924: Publications de la Société des études juives.
- cod. Ghironi: M. Steinschneider, *Catalog hebraischer Hand-*



- schriften, grössten Theils aus dem Nachlasse des Rabb. M. S. Ghironi (gest. 1852), welche von Sam. Schönblum in Lemberg zum Kaufe angeboten werden. Berlin 1872.
- cod. Gunzbourg: Senior Sachs, Catalogue (multigraphed) of the collection of David Gunzbourg (now in the Museum "Lenin" in Moscow)
- cod. HUC: codd. in Cincinnati Hebrew Union College. (information by Dr. M. Wilensky).
- cod. Halberstam: S. J. Halberstam, קהלת שלמה Catalog hebräischer Handschriften. Wien 1890 [codd. 1-411 in Jews' College, London; 412-539 in Jew. Theol. Sem., New York].
- cod. Hamburg: M. Steinschneider, Catalog der hebr. Handschriften in der Stadtbibliothek zu Hamburg. Hamburg 1878.
- cod. Hirschfeld: H. Hirschfeld, Descriptive catalogue of the Hebrew Mss. of the Montefiore Library. London 1904.
- cod. Jüdisches Museum, Wien: A. Z. Schwarz, Die hebräischen Handschriften in Oesterreich. Leipzig 1931.
- cod. D. Kaufmann: M. Weisz, Katalog der hebräischen Handschriften u. Bücher des Prof. Dr. D. Kaufmann. Frankfurt a. M. 1906.
- cod. Karlsruhe: [S. Landauer], Orientalische Handschriften. Karlsruhe 1892=Die Handschriften der Grossherzoglich Badischen Hof- und Landesbibliothek in Karlsruhe. 2.
- cod. Kennicott: B. Kennicott, Dissertatio generalis in Vetus Testamentum Brunovici 1783 [mostly from de Rossi, *Variae lectiones Vet. Test.* vol. 1 sq.]
- cod. Laurentiana: A. M. Biscioni, Bibliothecae Ebraicae, Graecae Florentinae sive Bibliothecae Mediceo-Laurentinae Catalogus, Florentiae 1757. 8°.
- cod. Leipzig: E. W. R. Naumann, Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum qui in bibliotheca senatoria civitatis Lipsiensis asservantur. Codices orientalium linguarum descripserunt H. O. Fleischer et Fr. Delitzsch. Grimmae 1838.
- cod. Levy: S. Goldschmidt, מַקְדָּשׁ מַעֲטָה Verzeichniss der Judaica aus der Bibliothek des Herrn Dr. B. Levy in Hamburg. Hamburg 1900. [now in Stadtbibliothek Hamburg].
- cod. Leyden: M. Steinschneider, Catalogus codicum hebraeorum

- bibliothecae academiae Lugduno-Batavae. Lugduni-Batavorum 1858.
- cod. Livorno: C. Bernheimer, Catalogue des manuscrits de la bibliothèque du Talmud Tora de Livourne. Livorno [1914].
- cod. Luzzatto: Joseph Luzzatto, Catalogue de la bibliothèque de littérature hébraïque et orientale de feu Samuel David Luzzatto. Padoue 1868.
- cod. Mantua: M. Mortara, Catalogo dei manoscritti ebraici della biblioteca della comunità israelitica di Mantova. Livorno 1878.
- cod. Marciana: M. Lattes, Catalogo dei codici ebraici della biblioteca Marciana. Firenze 1886. (Cataloghi dei codici orientali 3.)
- cod. Merzbacher: R. N. Rabinowitz, אהל אברהם רשימת הספרים אשר אסף. . . אברהם מערצבאכער. München, 1888.
- cod. Modena: S. Jona, Catalog der ebraeischen Handschriften der königl. Bibliothek in Modena. Belovar 1883.
- cod. Muenchen: M. Steinschneider, Die hebraeischen Handschriften der . . . Hof- und Staatsbibliothek in Muenchen. Muenchen 1895.
- cod. Nationalbibliothek in Wien: A. Z. Schwarz, Die hebr. Handschriften der Nationalbibliothek in Wien. Leipzig 1925.
- cod. Neofiti: G. Sacerdote, I codici ebraici della Pia Casa dei Neofiti in Roma. Roma 1893 [Estr. from: Reale academia dei Lincei. Serie 4a].
- cod. Nîmes: J. Simon, Les manuscrits hébreux de la Bibliothèque de Nîmes [in Revue des études juives III (1881), 225 sq.]
- cod. Oxford: Ad. Neubauer and A. E. Cowley, Catalogue of the Hebrew Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library 1. 2. Oxford 1886. 1906.
- cod. Paris: [H. Zotenberg], Manuscrits orientaux. Catalogues des manuscrits hébreux . . . de la bibliothèque impériale. Paris 1866.
- cod. Perreau: P. Perreau, Catalogo dei codici ebraici della biblioteca di Parma non descritti dal de Rossi. Firenze 1878 (Cataloghi dei codici orientali. 2.)
- cod. Prag: H. Brody, Die Handschriften der Prager jüd. Gemeindebibliothek (1.-3. Lieferung) in: "Talmud-Thora"

- Religionsschule der isr. Kultusgemeinde zu Prag. Bericht über [die Schuljahre] 1910/11–1913/14. Prag 1911–14.
- cod. R. N. Rabinowitz: רשימת ספרים 1; 2: 1881 cf. HB XXI, 58; 3: October 1882 cf. *ibid.* p. 105; 4: כ"ב אלול תרמ"ז; 5: כ"ב אלול תרמ"ה; 6; 7: כ"ו אלול תרמ"ד; 8: כ"ב אלול תרמ"ה; 9: טבת תרמ"ז; 10: תמוז תרמ"ז; 11: ר"ח אדר תרמ"ח; 12.–14.; 15: סיון תרמ"ט München-Frankfurt a. M.-Przemysl.
- cod. de Rossi: I. B. de Rossi, Mss. Codices hebraici bibliothecae I. B. de Rossi ab eodem descripti 1–3. Parmae 1803.
- cod. Saraval: [M. Steinschneider], Catalogue de la bibliothèque . . . de feu M. Leon V. Saraval. Trieste 1853.
- cod. Sassoon: D. S. Sassoon, אהל דוד Descriptive Catalogue of the Hebrew and Samaritan Manuscripts in the Sassoon Library, London 1. 2. London 1932
- cod. Scaliger: M. Steinschneider, Catalogus codicum hebraeorum bibliothecae academiae Lugduno-Batavae. Lugduni-Batavorum 1858.
- cod. Strassburg: S. Landauer, Katalog der hebraeischen Handschriften der K. Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek zu Strassburg. Strassburg 1881.
- cod. Sussex: T. J. Pettigrew, Bibliotheca Sussexiana. 1. London 1827.
- cod. Turin: B. Peyron, Codices Hebraici manu exarati Regiae bibliothecae quae in Taurinensi Athenaeo asservantur. Romae-Taurini-Florentiae 1880.
- cod. Urbin.: Assemani, Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae codicum manuscriptorum catalogus. Vol. 1. Romae 1756, pp. 409 sq.
- cod. Vat.: Assemani, Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae codicum manuscriptorum catalogus. Vol. 1. Romae 1756.
- cod. Vittorio Emanuele: Angelo di Capua, Catalogo dei codici ebraici della Biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele. [Firenze 1878]. (Cataloghi dei codici orientali 1).
- cod. Wright: H. Loewe, Catalogue of the manuscripts in the Hebrew character. Collected and bequeathed to Trinity College Library by the late William Aldis Wright. Cambridge 1926.
- Darmesteter Gloses: Arsène Darmesteter, Les Gloses françaises



- de Raschi dans la Bible, accompagnées de notes par Louis Brandin. Paris 1909.
- Ecrivains: Ad. Neubauer and E. Renan, Les écrivains juifs français du XIVe siècle. Paris 1893. (Histoire littéraire de la France, tome 31).
- Freimann, Manusc. Supercomm. on Rashi: Aron Freimann, Manuscript Supercommentaries on Rashi's Commentary on the Pentateuch. New York 1941. [Reprinted from the "Rashi Anniversary Volume" of the "American Academy for Jewish Research"].
- Gallia Judaica: H. Gross, Gallia Judaica. Dictionnaire géographique de la France d'après les sources rabbiniques. Paris 1897.
- H. B.: Hebraeische Bibliographie. Redigirt von M. Steinschneider. 1-21. Berlin 1858-82.
- HUeb.: M. Steinschneider, Die hebraeischen Uebersetzungen des Mittelalters. Berlin, 1893.
- Kobak, Jeschurun: Jeschurun. Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums. Hrsg. von Joseph Kobak 1-9. Lemberg-Fürth-Bamberg 1856-78.
- Ltbl. d. Orients: Der Orient . . . hrsg. von Julius Fürst [Nebst] Litteraturblatt 1-12. Leipzig, 1840-51.
- MGWJ: Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums 1-82. Dresden-Leipzig-Breslau-Krotoschin-Berlin-Frankfurt a. M. 1852-1938.
- Magazin: Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums hrsg. von A. Berliner u. D. Hoffmann 1-20. Berlin 1874-93.
- Mosè: Mosè. Anthologia Israelitica. Pubblicazione mensile . . . sotto la direzione di G. E. Levi 1-8. Corfu 1878-85.
- Rivista Israelitica. Periodico bimestriale . . . Diretto da S. H. Margulies 1-10. Firenze 1904-13.
- Vogelstein u. Rieger: H. Vogelstein und P. Rieger, Geschichte der Juden in Rome 1. 2. Berlin 1895. 1896.
- ZfHB.: Zeitschrift für hebräische Bibliographie. Hrsg. von A. Freimann 1-21. Berlin-Frankfurt a. M. 1896-1921.
- Zuckermann: B. Zuckermann, Katalog der Seminar-Bibliothek. Breslau 1870 (im Jahresbericht des jüdisch-theologischen Seminar "Fraenckel'scher Stiftung" 1870).

## LIST OF SCRIBES

1. ABBA MARI B. ELIA HĀLFAN ZARFATĪ,<sup>1</sup> cf. ZfHB XVIII, 58 nr. 2.
  - a 1478: cod. R. N. Rabinowitz, Cat IV (1883) p. 66 nr. 38 [סדרן Rite of Rome]
  - b [s. a.]: cod. de Rossi 556<sup>4</sup>  
[Mordecai Comtino, Commentary on Maimonides' "Millot ha-Higgayon"]  
ABDIA JESCIURUN, *see* OBADIA JESCHURUN.
2. ABIGDOR B. MENAḤEM KOHEN<sup>2</sup> AT FERMO,<sup>3</sup> cf. ZfHB XVIII, 58 nr. 4.
  - a Sivan 20, 1328: cod. de Rossi 870 for Menaḥem b. Elḥanan b. Meshullam  
[David Kimḥi, Commentary on Prophet. Minores].
3. ABRAHAM B. ABIGDOR, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 58 nr. 17; Blondheim, Liste p. 36 nr. 239.
  - a Tammuz 10, 1392: cod. de Rossi 333 for his brother Nathan [Rashis' Commentary on Pentateuch].
4. ABRAHAM B. ABRAHAM B. MOSES, cf. Magazin I, 13 = Berliner, Gesam. Schriften I, 43. Magazin 1881 p. 160.
  - a Tebet 20, 1332: cod. Vat. 163  
[Ahron ha-Levi, ס' החנוך]
5. ABRAHAM B. DANIEL ROPHE, cf. ZfHB XVII, 66 nr. 63; *ibid.* XVIII, 59 nr. 29. Steinschneider, Donnolo Nachträge p. 101 (163) Kobak, ישרון VII, 90.
  - a Nisan 13, 1464 probably at Bologna:<sup>4</sup> cod. Laurentiana Palatina 530 (Cat. in 8° p. 554).  
[Antidotarium of Montpellier]
6. ABRAHAM B. ELIAB, [about Eliab cf. Gallia Judaica p. 152. Zunz, Z. G. 88. 566],

<sup>1</sup> Abba Mari Hālfan ha-Rophe b. Elia Hālfan ha-Rophe was owner of cod. Nationalbibliothek Wien 173.

<sup>2</sup> Cod. de Rossi 928 was written for him.

<sup>3</sup> At Fermo is written: Adar 21, 1431 Maḥzor Rite of Ashkenaz cf. Servi in "Vesillo Israelitico" vol. XXXIX (1891) p. 148.

<sup>4</sup> In Bologna 1419 is written cod. Treves (Venice) cf. Cat. S. D. Luzzatto nr. 34. H. Ueb. 293 [Alfarabi במספר החכמות].

- a Kislev 1, 1474: cod. Parma 3498=cod. Perreau 18 (Cat. p. 51) HB XVII, 135 nr. 22.  
[Maḥzor Rite of Rome].
7. ABRAHAM B. HASDAI OF PERPIGNAN<sup>5</sup>  
a Maḥesvan 14, 1398 at Ancona; cod. Br. Mus. 223 for Joab b. Benjamin b. Joab b. Benjamin b. Moses b. Jeḥiel.  
[Levi b. Gershon Commentary on Job].  
b Iyyar 1402 at Ancona: cod. Oxford 302 for Samuel b. Isaac ha-Rophe of Rome  
[David Kimḥi commentary on the Prophets] cf. Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 321 n. 2.
8. ABRAHAM B. ḤAYYIM ZARFATI, cf. Magazin I, 37; HUeb. 785 n. 155. Vogelstein u. Rieger I 321 n. 4.  
a Maḥesvan 22, 1414 at San Severino: cod. Casanata 193 for Abraham b. Isaac<sup>6</sup> in Rieti.  
[Berhard de Gordon, שושן הרפואה].
9. ABRAHAM B. ISAAC, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 59 nr. 47.  
a Elul 25, 1377: cod de Rossi 151 for Jeḥiel Rophe cf. Zunz in Gg. wiss. Zeitschr. IV, 51=Ges. Schriften III, 172.  
[Jeḥiel Rophe, מעלות המדור].
10. ABRAHAM B. ISAAC OF LUCCA, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 59 nr. 49 finished on Friday the 29th of August 1330.  
[Abraham ibn Esra's astronomical and astrological treatises]; cod. Oxford 2023 is a copy which was made by W. Heidenheim.
11. ABRAHAM B. JACOB BENIETO IN VENICE.  
a [before 1454]: cod. Paris 740 for Don Isaac Albilia.  
[Joseph Albo, Ikkarim].
12. ABRAHAM ב. קה"ב B. JEKUTIEL, [about the abbreviation קה"ב cf. Zunz, Ges. Schriften III, 210].  
a Kislev 4, 1387 at Bologna: cod. Perreau 22 (HB VII, 116) [not in Cat. Perreau] for Israel b. Moses.  
[Jesaiah b. Elia di Trani פסקי סדר נשים]

<sup>5</sup> Abraham b. Hasdai, who wrote at Bologna cod. Turin 27 (allegedly in the year 1306 or 1311) is probably the same. Cf. HB XXI, 27; Bj. n 240; cf. cod. de Rossi 1162.

<sup>6</sup> Steinschneider in H Ueb. 705 n. 350 wrongly identifies the one who ordered the book as the scribe.



- b Shebat 13, 1391 at Bologna: cod. Jew. Theol. Sem. for Consola, the widow of Moses.  
[Maḥzor for ר"ה ויר"כ cf. Register 5685 p. 125, cf. J. Pearson, Bibliotheca Hebraica Selectissima = Schloss, Cat. Hodgson & Co. 1918 nr. 499.]
- c Tammuz 13, 1397 at Rovigo: cod. Ambros. 12 for Uziel b. Jacob. The vocalisation partly by Abraham, partly by Uziel b. Jacob 5th Sivan 1398.  
[Targum Onkelos on Pentateuch].
13. ABRAHAM B. JOAB de Synagoga הכנסת מן in Rome [Paola's father. Paola lived in Rome in 1288] cf. Zunz Litg. 356. Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 333. ZfHB XVIII, 59 nr. 39. Abraham is owner of cod. de Rossi 896. His daughter Paola in the colophon of cod. Saraval 27 = Zuckermann 104 and cod. Oxford 635 gives his name as: Abraham ha-Sofer b. Joab.
14. ABRAHAM B. YOMTOB HA-KOHEN in Rome, cf. Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 278. 308. Dukes in Ltbl. d. Orients X, 487. ZfHB XVIII, 59 nr. 40.
- a Ḥesvan 1, 1283: cod. Br. Mus. 906 for Shabbetai b. Matatia and his son Jedidia Solomon.  
[Maimonides, מורה נבוכים]
- b Marḥesvan 16, 1285: cod. de Rossi 221 for Shabbetai b. Matatia.  
[Maimonides, ס' המצות]
- c 1290: cod. Oxford 1173<sup>1</sup> for his master Menahem b. Benjamin b. Jehiel.  
[הגדה (Italian rite).]
15. ABRAHAM B. JOSEPH OF ROME, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 59 nr. 44.
- a Elul 1., 1463 in Crema (Lombardy):<sup>7</sup> Br. Mus. 914.  
[Shemtob ibn Palquera המעלות ס']
- b [s. a.] at Narni: cod. de Rossi 601.  
[Judah ha-Levi, כוזרי]
16. ABRAHAM B. JOSHUA HA-KOHEN
- a Nisan 5, 1484 at שנת אולליא San Giuliano?: cod. Br. Mus. 1139.  
[Pentateuch]

<sup>7</sup> Cod. Cincinnati, HUC 676 [Jacob b. Asher שו"ת משפט] written in Crema 1486 (information by Wilensky).

17. ABRAHAM B. MATATIA TREVES ZARFATI, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 59 nr. 66.
  - a Iyar 8, 1480 at Pesaro: cod. Sassoon 23 (Cat. p. 292) for Elia b. Solomon of Ravenna.  
[Maḥzor]
  - b Tebet 29, 1481: cod. de Rossi 900 for Raphael of Recanati cf. Brüll, Jahrb. I, 100.  
[Pentateuch and Megillot].
  - c Ab 13, 1481 at Pesaro: cod. D. Kaufmann 380 II for Jacob b. Solomon in Rimini.  
[Maḥzor. Seliḥot rite of Rome]
18. ABRAHAM B. MEIR, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 59 nr. 54. Punctator.
  - a [14th or 15th saec.]: cod. de Rossi 467.  
[Pentateuch and Megillot]
19. ABRAHAM B. MENAḤEM ALATRINO, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 59 nr. 57. Cassuto in Enc. Jud. II, 101.
  - a Adar 24, 1412: cod. de Rossi 527.  
[Juda b. Eleasar מנחת יהודה Supercomm. on Rashi]
  - b Kislev 15, 1420 or 1422: cod. München 201.  
[Collectanea].
  - c Kislev 1, 1421: cod. Talmud Tora in Rome  
[Joseph Zarfati b. Moses עיר סיחון] cf. Steinschneider in Bibliotheca Mathemat. 1899 p. 101. MGWJ 40 p. 376.
  - d Shebat 16, 1426: cod. de Rossi 286.  
[Collectanea of philosophical treatises]
20. ABRAHAM B. MENAḤEM OF MONTEPULCIANO (פולצא), cf. cod. Vat. 71, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 59 nr. 55.
  - a [15th saec.]: cod. Vat. 197 for Moses b. Judah Rophe, cf. ZfHB XVII, 26 nr. 1545.  
[David Kimḥi ס' השרשים]
21. ABRAHAM B. MESHULLAM, is hardly the name of the copyist of cod. Br. Mus. 1036, the epigraph refers to the translator cf. Marx in Add. and Corr. p. 200.
  - a 1496 at מונטי פוסקו Montefusco: cod. Br. Mus. 1036 for Jacob al-Maani (i. e. of Ma'an in Arabia).  
[Gerardus de Solo's Commentary on Book IX of Al-Razi's "Al-Mansuri"].
22. ABRAHAM B. MORDECAI HA-LEVI, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 59 nr. 60.

- a Shebat 11, 1430: cod. Oxford 1052. 1053 for Zemaḥ (Solomon b. Abraham).  
[Maḥzor. German rite].
- b Elul 8, 1432: cod. Karlsruhe 11 (Cat. p. 22).  
[סדרה German rite]
- 23. ABRAHAM B. MOSES, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 59, nr. 62.
  - a Adar I. 18, 1389 at Assisi: cod. de Rossi 1134 for Shabbethai b. Matatia.  
[Mishne Tora book III and IV].
- 24. ABRAHAM B. MOSES B. MENAḤEM דיי, cf. ZfHB XVIII 59 nr. 62.
  - a Tammuz 12, 1349: cod. Oxford 2636.  
[Tobia b. Eliezer, לקח טוב on Genesis and Exodus].
- 25. ABRAHAM HA-SOPHER B. MOSES ROPHE, cf. Magazin I, 96, cf. owner of cod. München 111 (Cat.<sup>2</sup> p. 69).
  - a Shebat 11, 1454: cod. Corsini in Rome for Immanuel b. Uziel.  
[Naḥmanides on Pentateuch]
- 26. ABRAHAM B. NATHAN, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 59 nr. 69.
  - a [before 1420]: cod. de Rossi 99.  
[Judah b. Benjamin הלכות שחיטה]
- 27. ABRAHAM B. SOLOMON, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 60 nr. 78.
  - a Kislev 12, 1441 at Cortona: cod. de Rossi 828.  
[Psalmi, Proverbias and Job]
  - b Iyyar 3, 1457 at Mantua: cod. Br. Mus. 976 for Joseph Zark.  
[Joseph b. Judah b. Isaac Zark בעל הלשון].
- 28. ABRAHAM B. SOLOMON B. BARUCH CONAT,<sup>8</sup> cf. Zunz ZG 249. ZfHB XVII, 89 nr. 508. Haberman in "Alim" II (1935), p. 81 sq.
  - a [15th cent.] at Mantua: cod. Sassoon 516 (Cat. p. 22) for Matatia b. Nathan.  
[Pentateuch and Haftaroḥ].
- 29. ABRAHAM ב"ר משה HA-SOFER B. SOLOMON HA-ROPHI HA-SAKEN, cf. Magazin VIII, 166. ZfHB XVIII, 38 nr. 1781; ibid. XVIII, 60 nr. 82.

<sup>8</sup> Bendet Conat was the owner of cod. Cambridge 72 cf. Schiller-Szinessi, cat. p. 243.

<sup>9</sup> מני ע"ל אלקים מושע ישרא"ל = Ps. 7,11.



- a Sivan 1, 1382: cod. München 327 [from the copy of Joab b Jehiel] cf. HB XI, 103; Zunz Ges. Schr. III, 169.  
[קצור חובות הלבבות].
- b Nisan 8, 1399 at Modigliano: cod. Zelada = cod. Toledo 7  
[Jacob Anatoli, מלמד התלמידים] cf. J. Millas Vallicrosa, *Manuscriptos Hebraicos en Toledo in Al-Andalus*, Vol. II, 1934 p. 408.
- c [s. a.]: cod. Turin 120 for Jehiel.  
[Rashi's Commentary on Kiddushin, Ketubot and Gittin],  
cf. Darmesteter, *Glosses* p. 8.
- d [s. a.]: cod. Oxford 1068.  
[פליחות] cf. ZfHB XVIII, 59 nr. 58.
- 30. ABRAHAM B. SAMUEL OF PADUA.
  - a Ab 28, 1311 at Rieti: cod. Paris 1284.  
[Judah Ḥarizi חזקוני].
- 31. ABRAHAM B. SAMUEL.
  - a Adar 21, 1426: Br. Mus. 215 for Jacob b. Samuel.  
[Nathan b. Samuel Tibbon זכרון טוב].
- 32. ABRAHAM B. SAMUEL B. ISAAC, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 60 nr. 84.
  - a Adar 27, 1282: cod. Karlsruhe 14 for Joseph b. Abraham.  
[David Kimḥil מכלול].
- 33. Abraham Farissol b. Mordecai. Bibliography: A. Freimann in ZfHB XIII, 30–31 and 63 U. Cassuto, *Firenze* 326; *Enc. Jud.* VI, 937.
  - a Kislev 4, 1469: cod. Ambros. 14.  
[Index of Biblical references in מורה נבוכים].
  - b Sivan 28, 1470 at Mantua: cod. Oxford 2567.  
[Joseph b. Solomon Astruc Duran מלא כף נחת].
  - c 1470: cod. R. N. Rabinowitz Cat. VII (1884) p. 94 nr. 146.  
[Maḥzor Rite of Rome].
  - ca Tammuz 2, 1471 at Ferrara: cod. Jew. Theol. Sem.  
[Siddur Italian rite]; cf. Register 1920 p. 32.
  - d Shebat 5, 1472 at Mantua: cod. Oxford 1392 for the two brothers Judah and Jacob.  
[Judah Messer Leon, Commentaries on Averroes].
  - e August 1473: cod. Laurent. Pl. 88, 32 (Cat. p. 497).  
[ש' המבקש Averroes Analytica].

- ea Nisan 28, 1473 at Mantua: cod. Gunzbourg 180  
 [עלילות דברים]; cf. אוצר נחמד IV 214; HB VII, 27.
- eb 1474 at Ferrara: Cod. de Rossi 145<sup>13</sup>  
 [Letters of Farissol to Judah Messer Leon and others].  
 (Cod. 145<sup>1</sup> [רוח חן] was copied by Farissol at Avignon 1468).
- f Nisan 14, 1478 at Ferrara: cod. Br. Mus. 621 for Bonaventura Vigeveno of Cremona.<sup>10</sup>  
 [סדור Italian rite].
- g Shebat 1479 at Ferrara: cod. de Rossi 1129.  
 [סדור Italian rite].
- h Marḥesvan 14, 1481: cod. Benzion 28 for Samuel מפולא in Sermide (HB IX, 115).  
 [Rashi on Pentateuch].
- i Tebet 30, 1482 at סירמיני Sermide (near Mantua): cod. Br. Mus. 622.  
 [סדור Italian rite]
- k Adar II 28, 1482 at Sermide (near Mantua): cod. de Rossi 79 for Samuel Maffole (?) מפולא  
 [David Kimḥi, Commentary on Prophet. Minores].
- l 1482 at Ferrara: cod. Parma 3503 (Cat. p. 153 nr. 1) cf. HB VII, 118 (but not Kennicott 125).  
 [Part of Hagiographa].
- m Tammuz 16, 1484 at Bologna: cod. David Frankel (Cat. 57 nr. 16) = HUC. 331 for Joseph Caravita in his house.  
 [סדור Rite of Rome].
- ma Sivan 1, 1485: Cod. S. Kirschstein; cf. Die Judaica Sammlung S. Kirschstein-Berlin Versteigerung Hugo Helbing, München 1932 p. 13 nr. 215.  
 [Siddur]
- n Adar 13, 1486 at Sermide (near Mantua): Kennicott 125 = Br. Mus. 95 for Samuel of פולא  
 [Pentateuch, Megillot, Psalms, Job and Haphtarot].
- o Marḥesvan 22, 1488 at גורינו (Goriano?): cod. Jew. Theol. Sem = cod. Adler 1230 (Cat. p. 5?) for Joseph b. Isaac Gallico.  
 [אילן kabbalistic; appended to a Maḥzor rite of Rome]  
 cf. ZfHB XIII, 63.

<sup>10</sup> 1496 Dattilo di Elia da Vigeveno in Firenze was owner of an incomplete Bible. Cf. Cassuto, Firenze 225.

- p Hānnucah 1487 at Ferrara: cod. de Rossi 1118 for Mikhael b. Benjamin ha-Rofe  
[סדרה Italian rite].
- q Adar II 16, 1492 at Ferrara: cod. Adler 1396 (Cat. p. 39)  
= Jew. Theol. Sem. for Immanuel of Camerino.  
[Maḥzor, rite of Rome, and Psalms] cf. ZfHB XIII, 63.
- r 1494 at Ferrara: cod. J. Kauffmann, Kat. 25 (1896) nr. 129  
for Immanuel b. Noah Raphael da Norsa at Ferrara.  
[Maḥzor, rite of Rome], cf. A. Marx, *Studies in Jew. Hist. and Booklore*, p. 108–109.
- s Elul 1, 1496 at Ferrara: cod. Adler 370 (Cat. p. 3) = Jew. Theol. Sem. for Immanuel b. Noah Raphael da Norsa at Ferrara  
[Pentateuch and Megillot. cf. *Illustrations in Cat. Adler* nr. 35a], cf. A. Marx, *Studies . . .* p. 108–109.
- t [end of 15th saec.]: cod. Asher 14 = cod. Strassburg 9.  
[More Nebukhim]
- u Maḥṣevan 1500 at Ferrara: cod. Turin 251.  
[סדרה Rite of Rome].
- v [cr. 1500]: cod. Yale University Library, Hebrew 13.  
[Maḥzor Rite of Rome], cf. Nemoy in *Journal of Jewish Bibliography*, Vol. I (1939), p. 108.
- w [Abraham Farissol is perhaps the scribe (without name) of the illustrated Bible: cod. Fl. Servi, cf. *Vessillo Israelitico* Vol. 39 p. 147 = J. Kauffmann, *Cat.* 66 (1912) nr. 1758, finished 1489 [the present owner: William Roth in New York].
34. ABRAHAM TRABOT ZARFATI, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 59 nr. 36.  
a 1458 at Imola: cod. de Rossi 325 for Jacob b. Judah in Modena.  
[Maḥzor Rite of Rome].
- b Maḥṣevan 6., 1463: cod. Turin 31.  
[Naḥmanides' Commentary on Pentateuch, Part I]  
[Part II: Numeri etc. is written by Isaiah b. Jacob Aluf of Maseran cf. HB XX, 128. *Magazin* II, 16. CB 2053].
35. ABRAHAM B. UZIEL OF SALERNO, cf. Blondheim, *Liste* p. 9 nr. 7.  
a Iyar 15, 1289: cod. Berlin 65 for Menaḥem b. Menaḥem.  
[Rashi on Pentateuch].



36. AḤIMAAZ B. MENAḤEM B. ISAAC, cf. Angelo di Capua, Cat. p. 92.
  - a Elul 25, 1384: cod. Angelica 14.  
[David Kimḥi דוד קימחי].
37. AHRON, a Bookseller, spent seven years in Toledo, brought with him cr. 1300–1320 to Perugia a Catalogue of 180 works. He was ridiculed by Immanuel p. 80 sq., cf. Zunz ZG 233. Zunz, Ges. Schriften III, 179.
38. AHRON B. BENJAMIN HA-ROPHE, cf. Blondheim, Liste p. 33 nr. 211; Darmesteter 5 (R.).
  - a 1424: cod. Paris 160 for Solomon b. Nissim.  
[Rashi on Pentateuch].
39. AHRON B. ḤAYYIM HA-KOHEN.
  - a Shebat 1347 in מגדל פלסוט: cod. Berlin 32 for Mordecai d'Osimo.  
[Biblia with Masora = cod. de Rossi extr. 39 cf. Var. Lect. I p. CXXIX].
40. AHRON B. GABRIEL OF FIRENZE, cf. Cassuto, Firenze 189.
  - a On April 4, 1473 he wrote: [Psalterium] for Federico II d'Urbino.
41. AHRON B. LEVI, cf. Magazin I, 60.
  - a Elul 24, 1310: cod. de Rossi 12.  
[He finished the Punctuation of the Pentateuch with Targum].
42. AHRON B. MENAḤEM, cf. Zunz, ZG 217; ZfHB XVIII, 60 nr. 105.
  - a Elul 13, 1367 (?): cod. de Rossi 356 for Nissim b. Solomon of Ancona.  
[Abraham ibn Ezra Commentary on Pentateuch].
43. AHRON B. MORDECAI, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 60 nr. 103.
  - a Ab 8, 1475: cod. Saraval 41 = Zuckermann 107.  
[Zeraḥiah b. Isaac ha-Levi זרחיה בן יצחק הכהן].
44. ARJE B. ELIEZER ḤALFAN, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 62 nr. 199. Sonne in HUCA XVI, 53.
  - a Tebet 18, 1478 at Ferrara: cod. Paris 332 for his master Nathanael b. Shebbetai.  
[Abot with Maimonides' Commentary].

- b Shebat 22, 1479 at Cremona: cod. de Rossi 1056.  
[סדר].
- c Kislev 26, 1490 at Isola della Scala: cod. Seminario Vescovile in Padua for Isaac Yakar Rophe.  
[Pentateuch with Targum and Rashi, Megillot and Haph-tarot], cf. Sonne in HUCA XVI, 53.
- d Tammuz 8, 1491 at Isola della Scala: cod. Br. Mus. 210 for Pinhas Yakar b. Isaac Yakar.  
[Nahmanides' Commentary on Pent.]
- e Shebat 22, 1494: cod. Oxford 697 for Israel and Joseph Physicians (הרופאים) sons of Abraham of Ancona.  
[Jacob b. Asher, טורים].
- f Kislev 13, 1495: Kennicott 253 = Zürich, Stadtbibliothek for Judah קמ"ה רני"ה of Camerino.  
[Biblia] cf. Kennicot, Dissertatio ed. Bruns p. 435, Neu-bauer in Israel. Letterbook II, 93.
- g [s. a.]: cod. Adler 2007 (Cat. p. 32. 38) = Jew. Theol. Sem.  
[Maḥzor, Italian rite].
45. ASHER B. JEHIEL HA-KOHN RAPA called Cohen Rapa עושכין  
a Shebat 1473 at Mestre (קשטיל משחריא) in טערװיאן (Tervis):  
cod. Jew. Theol. Sem.  
[Jacob Mölln מור"ל].
46. AZARIA B. JOSEPH IBN ABBA MARI called Bonfils Astruc of  
Perpignan, cf. Gallia Jud. 475. REJ V, 41. H. Ueb. 466.  
a 1453 at Bari: cod. D. Kaufmann 284 for Abraham de  
Balmes.  
[Aristoteles שאחר הטבע].
47. AZARIA ASHKENASI B. MOSES, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 114 nr. 1029.  
a Marḥesvan 22, 1450: cod. extr. de Rossi 55 = cod. Nani in  
Venice.  
[Isaiah with David Kimḥi's Commentary].
48. BARUCH was the scribe of cod. Ginsburg 27 = Br. Mus. 75;  
a contemporary reviser of the codex was Isaac Nakdan,  
cf. Ginsburg, Introduction to the Hebrew Bible, p. 631.  
Perhaps a German copyist of the 13th or 14th cent.
49. BARUCH B. NATHANAEL LEVI, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 63 nr. 244.  
a Marḥesvan 1407 at Bologna: cod. de Rossi 936.  
[Targum Onkelos].

50. BARUCH B. SOLOMON B. JOAB [BETH-EL], cf. Zunz, Ges. Schr. III, 174. Kobak ישרון VI 102; H. B. XIV, 41 n. 2; H. Ueb. 558. Cassuto Firenze 247.
  - a Shebat 25, 1451 at Montalcino: cod. Vat. 396.  
[Al-'Hassar חשבון].
51. BARUCH B. SIMSON ZARFATI, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 63 nr. 246.
  - a [14th or 15th cent.]: Br. Mus. 192 for Mordecai b. Judah.  
[Abraham ibn Ezra, Commentary on the Pent.].
52. BARUCH HA-SOFER [IBN JAISCH] (perhaps in Spain), cf. ZfHB XVIII, 63 nr. 245; H. Ueb. 219 note 800.
  - a Kislev 17, 1484 in urbe Ariani: cod. de Rossi 285 for Jehiel Rophe b. Moses.  
[Averroes' Commentary on Logica].
53. BENJAMIN B. ABRAHAM ROPHE ANAW in Rome. Brother of Zidkia ha-Rophe, author of שבלי הלקט, cf. Zunz, Benjamin of Tudela II, 21; Zunz, Ges. Schr. III, 168, ZfHB XVIII, 62 nr. 217; Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 277 and 374.
  - a Ab 17, 1260: cod. de Rossi 331.  
[Hagiographa]
  - b He added notes to the commentary on R. Aḥai's Sheeltot by Solomon b. Shabbethai in cod. Oxford 541.
54. BENJAMIN הלבלר B. BARUCH, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 62 nr. 216, cf. cod. Oxford 79 perhaps another scribe.
  - a 1312 at Corneto [Tarquinia] on the Marta (מרטא): cod. Paris 81.  
[Prophets].
  - b [15th cent.]: cod. Berlin 51 for Isaac b. Ḥananel.  
[Prayers and hymns German Rite].
55. BENJAMIN אֵלִיָּה B. ELIA לעץ de Macerata from the family Canaruto (קנרוטי), cf. Zunz, Ges. Schr. III, 211. ZfHB XVIII, 62 nr. 218; Magazin I, 48 = Berliner, Ges. Schr. I, 79; HB V, 48; XXI, 73.
  - a Elul 12, 1372 at ביסי (Visso) [wrongly Massa in Zunz, ZG 521 note a]: Vat. 77 for Solomon Rophe b. Benjamin Rophe cf. ZfHB XVIII, 40 nr. 1821.  
[David Kimḥi, Commentary on the Psalms].



56. BENJAMIN B. EPHRAIM OF AREZZO.  
 a Sivan 3, 1443: cod. Jew. Theol. Sem.  
 [Illuminated סדרו].
57. BENJAMIN B. IMMANUEL of Norcia, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 63 nr. 233, Bibliotheca Mathematica. III. Folge. II, p. 68.  
 a Shebat 28, 1474 at Reggio: cod. Halle cf. Selig Wigdor in  
 המליץ, 1889, Nr. 180 (August 14.)  
 [Pentateuch with Targum].  
 b Nisan 24, 1477 at Reggio: cod. Oxford 2183 for his cousin  
 David b. Joab Immanuel Finzi of Arezzo (?).  
 [כתב התנצלות, Jedaiah Penini].
58. BENJAMIN B. ISAAC.  
 a Kislev 16, 1431 at Fano: cod. Oxford 218 for Joseph יענול  
 b. Solomon cf. HB XX, 125.  
 [Abraham ibn Ezra, Commentary on Pent. and Megilloth].
59. BENJAMIN B. ISAAC b. Benjamin b. Solomon b. Judah b.  
 Benjamin Finzi b. Menaḥem b. Judah b. Menaḥem [משפחת  
 ר"ם cf. CB 2058. HB V, 147; XIV, 86, REJ IX, 153;] cf.  
 ZfHB XVIII, 63 nr. 228.  
 a Iyyar 2, 1361: Jew. Theol. Semin.  
 [Mischna Moed].  
 b [s. a.]: Urb. 32 for Benjamin b. Isaac מגרני (of Aire) cf. cod.  
 Berlin 112 (Cat. I p. 89) for Judah.  
 [Isaac of Düren שערים].
60. BENJAMIN B. ISAAC B. JEKUTIEL, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 63 nr. 230;  
 Blondheim, Liste p. 39 nr. 275.  
 a Nisan 13, 1370 at Narni: cod. de Rossi 1082.  
 [Rashi on Pentateuch]
61. BENJAMIN B. JACOB HA-ROPHE  
 a Kislev 1, 1372: cod. Nationalbibl. Wien 142 (Cat. p. 155).  
 [Kalonymos מאמר משרת משה]  
 b Adar II 15, 1373: cod. Adler 399<sup>2</sup> (Cat. p. 53).  
 [Moses b. Maimon אגרת תימן etc.]
62. BENJAMIN B. JEḤIEL B. MESHULLAM, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 63  
 nr. 227; ZfHB XIX, 131.

<sup>2</sup> Rotundo (?) cf. H Ueb. 677; ישורון VII, 88. A liturgical poet Solomon  
 שדי שוכן על כסא רם וגורא. beg. Sacerdote, Cat. Casanata p. 651: Cf. no. 121.

- a Iyyar 14, 1400: cod. de Rossi 959 for Ezra b. Isaac in Perugia [Maḥzor Rite of Rome]
- 63. BENJAMIN B. JUDAH, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 62 nr. 224.
  - a Tammuz 29, 1463: cod. Oxford 980. [Jacob Anatoli, מלמד התלמידים].
- 64. BENJAMIN B. JOAB ANAW מן הכנסת de Synagoga in Rome, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 63 nr. 225; Zunz, Litg. 363; Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 278. 333.
  - a [sold in Viterbo 1284]: cod. Paris 176 for Solomon b. Moses b. Jekutiel and his grandson Judah cf. HB XI, 103. [Abraham ibn Ezra, Commentary on the Pentateuch].
  - b Adar I, 23, 1292: cod. Casanata 11. [Targum Onkelos]
  - c 1292: cod. de Rossi 182. [Levi b. Gershon, Commentary on Job].
  - d Tebet 13, 1293: cod. Ginsburg 20 = Br. Mus. 124 cf. Ginsburg, Introduction to the Hebrew Bible, p. 574. [Former and later Prophets].
- 65. BENJAMIN B. JOAB ANAW or de' Piatelli in Rome, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 63 nr. 225. Zunz Ges. Schr. III, 174. HB XI, 104; Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 333.
  - a Ab 12, 1403: cod. Paris 814. [Joseph Gikatilia, ס' האורה].
  - b [s. a.]: cod. Asher 9 = Halb. 157 = Hirschf. 410 (HB XI, 104). [מבוא הרקדוק by a certain Benjamin].
  - c [s. a.] at Rome: punctuation in cod. de Rossi 1261. [Biblia].
- 66. BENJAMIN B. MATATIA, cf. CB 2854 nr. 7886; HB VI, 21; Lebrecht, Handschriften des Talmud p. 57. 59.
  - a June (?) 8, 1431 at Siena: cod. Almanzi 263 = cod. Br. Mus. 1085<sup>2</sup>. [A short astronomical tractate].
- 67. BENJAMIN B. MENAHEM B. MOSES, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 63 nr. 229; Blondheim, Liste p. 14, nr. 45.
  - a [14th or 15th saec.]: cod. Asher 3 = Levy 14 for Moses Rophe cf. ZfHB XVIII, 26 nr. 1545. [Rashi on Pentateuch]. [Steinschneider established in ZfHB XVIII, 26 nr. 1545]

- that the scribes' name is: Benjamin b. Menaḥem b. Moses not Menaḥem b. Moses].
68. BENJAMIN ROPHE, of Pesaro, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 80 nr. 324.  
 a Shebat 22, 1324 at Pesaro: cod. Casanata 77 for Jacob b. Abraham of Mantua.  
 [Maḥzor Italian rite].
69. BENJAMIN B. החסיד SHABBETHAI.  
 a [14th cent.]: cod. Berlin 208.  
 [Pseudo-Aristoteles הסודות, etc.].  
 b [s. a.]: R. N. Rabinowitz Cat. VII (1884) p. 7 nr. 87 = cod. D. Kaufmann 289.  
 [Solomon ibn Gabirol מבחר הפנינים, etc.].
70. BENJAMIN HOSHAYA B. IMMANUEL of Sulmona of the family Zifroni, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 62 nr. 220.  
 a Sivan 9, 1487 at ציוטה דטיטי (Civitanino?): cod. de Rossi 279.  
 [Immanuel b. Jacob שש כנפים].
71. BENJAMIN JEDIDIAH B. ISAAC, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 62 nr. 221.  
 a Nisan 1439: cod. de Rossi 1298 for Joseph b. Joseph in Rimini.  
 [David Kimḥi, שרשים].
72. BENZION B. RAPHAEL, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 63 nr. 235.  
 a Shebat 23, 1474: cod. de Rossi 755.  
 [Prophiat Duran מעשה אפור].
73. BENZION B. SOLOMON ROPHE, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 63 nr. 237.  
 a [15th cent.] at Modigliano: cod. de Rossi 558 for . . . b. Daniel.  
 [Ahron ha-Levi ס' החינוך].
74. BERAKIEL B. HISKIA RAPHAEL TRABOT שבצרפתים, גדול, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 63 nr. 251. Blondheim, Liste p. 27 nr. 155; HB XV, 5; Gallia Jud. 221.  
 a Tammuz 22, 1472: Kennicott 567 = cod. Oxford 26 for Abraham רבא Rabbā.  
 [Pentateuch with Targum and Rashi, Megillot and Haphtarot].  
 b Tammuz 18, 1478: Jüdisches Museum Wien, cod. 158 in Cat. Schwarz p. 105.  
 [סדר Rite of Rome].



- c Nisan 7, 1490 at Firenze<sup>12</sup>: cod. Modena 6 for Elia and his wife Bruneta cf. *Magazin* II, 96. *Magazin* IV, 55 = Berliner, *Ges. Schriften* I, 108.  
[Maḥzor].
75. BEZALEL B. BARUCH לעי"ץ אל-י = Beth-El, cf. *ZfHB* XVIII, 63 nr. 239. Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 333.  
a Tisri 4, 1457: cod. de Rossi 1108 cf. *Magazin* I, 13.  
[Naḥmanides, Commentary on Pentateuch].  
b Shebat 16, 1463 at Solmona: cod. Casanata 117.  
[Isaac of Corbeil עמודי הגולה].
76. BEZALEL B. ZIDKIA B. ELIA.  
a Adar 28, 1450 at פורצי (Porcia, Prov. Udine)?: cod. Neofiti 14.  
[Jeḥiel b. Jekutiel, מעלות המדות].
77. DANIEL B. ABRAHAM CASTRO in Rome, cf. *ZfHB* XVIII, 64 nr. 290; CB 1985; *ZfHB* XVII, 92 nr. 556.  
a Kislev 9, 1451 at Rome: cod. Vat. 260 for Eliezer Rophe  
b. Menaḥem in the Yeshiba of Moses Rieti, cf. CB 1985. *ZfHB* XVII, 123 nr. 699.  
[Moses Narboni, Commentary on כוונות].
78. DANIEL B. AHRON wrote a Haggada before 1330, which together with cod. de Rossi 76 (Rashi's Commentary on the Prophets) was pawned Ab 8, 1330 by his son Ahron, cf. Berliner, *Ges. Schriften* I, 24.
79. DANIEL B. BENJAMIN הבן (about the chiffré הבן, cf. Zunz, *Ges. Schr.* III, 211).  
a Nisan 4, 1399: cod. Paris 627 for Shabbethai b. Isaac.  
[Maḥzor, Rite of Rome].
80. DANIEL B. SAMUEL HA-ROPHE B. DANIEL דיין in Pisa, [about the chiffré דיין cf. Zunz, cf. *ZfHB* XVIII, 44 nr. 1909; Luzzatto, מבוא I, 20; Lattes, *Notizie* p. 24. Mosè II, 177; *MGWJ* 62, p. 287.  
a Iyyar 6, 1390 at Bertinoro: cod. Ch. Meir Horowitz, Cat. I (1883) nr. 6 = cod. Br. Mus. 617.

<sup>12</sup> Bible finished in Firenze 48 of the Sephira 1455: cod. Casanata 283 (Cat. p. 488). A baptized Jew wrote the two Bible MSS: Laurentiana P. I, 31.

[סדר with Psalms, Proverbs, Job, five Megillot and Haphtarot (illustrated)].

- b 1398 at Pisa finished 1405 at Perugia: cod. Venice, libreria delle Scuole Israelitiche (ת"ת).

[Pentateuch with Massora parva].

81. DANIEL B. SOLOMON ROPHE, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 64 nr. 289; *ibid.* XVII, 92 nr. 555, Carmoly, *Hist. d. med. juifs* p. 133.

- a Shebat 3, 1429 at אופידה Offida on Tessino and Trento: cod. Oxford 1961.

[a mystical treatise on the tree of life, etc.]

- b Elul 1448 at הר נאה Belmonte [near Fano]: cod. M. S. Ghirondi (Padova) = Luzzatto 55 = cod. Halberst. 213 = Cod. Hirschf. 15; cf. Luzzatto in כ"ח III, 174; IV, 131: אגרת שר"ל nr. 406.

[Abraham ibn Ezra and abridgment of Levi b. Gershon, Commentary on Pentateuch].

82. DANIEL B. SOLOMON, cf. Zunz in Benjamin of Tudela II nr. 71; ZfHB XVIII, 64 nr. 289.

- a 1467–1468 in פורצי (Porcia, Prov. Udine)?: cod. Scaliger 13 (Cat. p. 358).

[Glosses on Abraham ibn Ezra, Commentary on Daniel] cf. cod. de Rossi 402 N. 10; Zunz ZG 90.

83. DAVID B. AHRON, cf. Zunz, ZG 517; ZfHB XVIII, 63 nr. 263.

- a Elul 8, 1439 at Sciacca (Sicily): cod. Comunità Israelitica in Rome = cod. extr. Rossi 13 for Levi b. Joseph Shneur.

[Pentateuch].

84. DAVID B. ELIA (בן הקדוש ר' אליהו וצוק"ל).

- a Ab 3, 1297: cod. Paris 217.

[Isaiah of Trani, Commentary on Prophets].

85. DAVID B. ELIA ROPHE in Palermo. Zunz ZG 516; HB I, 17 n. 4; ZfHB XVII, 93 nr. 588, ZfHB XVIII, 63 nr. 266.

- a 1342 (?) at Palermo: cod. Vat. 361 for Moses Kimḥi.

[פירוש מלות זרות בתורה].

86. DAVID B. GERSHON, cf. Dukes, *Proverb.* p. 47; ZfHB XVIII, 63 nr. 268; Blondheim, *Liste* p. 32 nr. 205.

- a Kislev 1—Elul 14, 1298: cod. Paris 154 for his brother Levi b. Gershon.  
[Biblia].
87. DAVID B. JOSEPH B. DAVID IBN YAḤYA, (grandfather of the historian Gedalja), born 1465, was Dayyan in Naples, teacher of Widmanstadt, wrote in his youth:  
a cod. D. Kaufmann 286.  
[Gazzali *בהניין וטבע ואלקות* CB 864.
88. DAVID B. MENAḤEM of Arles, cf. Cassuto in REJ 89 (1930) p. 269; Cassuto in *Festschrift Kaminka* p. 140 nr. 42  
a September 5, 1499 at Cento: cod. de Rossi ital. 6 for Bona, wife of Bonaventura di Solomon delli Chazaketti da Este [סדור in the Italian language].
89. DAVID B. NATHAN  
a Sivan 9, 1309: cod. Marciana 15 (Cat. p. 251).  
[*מחברת הערוך*].
90. DAVID B. SAMUEL YERUSHALMI, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 64 nr. 285; Freimann, *Manuscr. Supercomm. on Rashi* nr. 62.  
a Kislev 18, 1429: cod. Oxford 203 for Elia b. Joseph שחרוניאלו.  
[Dosa ha-Yewani b. Moses of Vidin, *Supercomm. on Rashi*].
91. DAVID ZEMAḤ B. BENJAMIN, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 64 nr. 286.  
a Elul 12, 1469: cod. Saraval 61 = Zuckermann 68 for Moses of Carpi (not Corfu).  
[סדור Italian Rite (with Haggada shel Pesach)].
92. ELASAR B. JOSEPH חזן see Eliezer (Elasar?) b. Joseph Ashkenasi.  
a Tebet 24, 1470 at Mestre: cod. Sigm. Nauheim Frankfurt: a. M.) = cod. Nat. Bibl. Jerusalem for Freida, wife of Ḥayyim Rapa Stein.<sup>13</sup>  
[Haggada (illuminated)].
93. ELASAR PARNAS in Reggio, [wrote with his left hand], cf. ZfHB XVII, 96 nr. 643.  
a Nisan 13, 1483: cod. Ghirondi 114B.  
[Averroes, *Commentary on ס' המופת* translated by Jacob Anatoli] cf. H. Ueb. 60.

<sup>13</sup> Ḥayyim Stein, cf. לקט יושר, Intr. p. XXX nr. 48; I p. 159; Intr. p. XXIII nr. 24. Brann in *Centenarium Rappoport* p. 396; A. Freimann in *Journal of Jewish Bibliography I* (1939), p. 9–10.



94. ELHANAN B. JOAB ELIA of Correggio.
  - a Kislev 15, 1463: cod. Almanzi 62 = Br. Mus. 897.  
[Baḥya b. Joseph, חובות הלבבות].
95. ELHANAN B. YOMTOB HA-KOHEN, cf. Meyer Abraham, Catalogue (1924) p. 8 = REJ 79, p. 8.
  - a 1403: cod. de l'Ecole Rabbinique de France 39.  
[Mordecai b. Hillel, מרדכי].
96. ELHANAN B. JOSEPH
  - a [14th cent.]: cod. Ambrosiana 86 nr. 5.  
[Solomon ibn Gabirol כתר מלכות].
97. ELHANAN B. MOSES B. ELHANAN, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 60 nr. 117.
  - a Shebat 24, 1342: cod. de Rossi 930 for the brothers Jehiel and Daniel b. Abraham.  
[David Kimḥi, מכלול].
98. ELHANAN B. SIMSON of Calabria, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 60 nr. 119.
  - a Ab 4, 1462 at Gubbio: cod. de Rossi 790 for Samuel b. Jekutiel.  
[Moses of Coucy, סמ"ג].
99. ELIA B. DAVID, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 61 nr. 128. A. Berliner, Ges. Schr. I, 13. A. Berliner, Aus Handschriften in D. Hoffmann Festschrift p. 290.
  - a Kislev 28, 1381: cod. de Rossi 1140.  
[Nathan b. Samuel זכרון טוב].
100. ELIA ב. צבי DAVID מר זהב [Michael אור החיים nr. 101 wrote ב. Muallam in Lecce, cf. ZfHB XIV, 107 nr. 24 where he is given as Spanish copyist, ZfHB XVII, 93 nr. 589 [wrongly: David b. Elia] also: ZfHB XVI, 181; ZfHB XVIII, 61 nr. 129; HB I, 17 n. 4; JQR XI, 145.
  - a Kislev 12, 1414 at Lecce: cod. Saraval 44 = Zuckermann 37 for his son David ha-Rophe.  
[Ezra Gatigno, סדר ה' ליראיו].
  - b Tebet 20, 1415 at Lecce: cod. Saraval 48 = Zuckermann 60 for his son David ha-Rophe.  
[Josua ibn Shoeib מדרש התורה].
  - c Nisan 11, 1423: cod. Oxford 230.  
[Ezra Gatigno, סדר ה' ליראיו].
101. ELIA B. ISAAC, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 61 nr. 136.

- a 1393: cod. Turin 86.  
[Mordecai b. Hillel, מרדכי].
- b Shebat 1394: cod. de Rossi 926 for Isaiah b. Reuben.  
[David Kimḥi, ס' השרשים].
- 102. ELIA B. JACOB צולו קארי, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 61 nr. 135.  
ZfHB XIV, 107 nr. 25.
- a 1428: cod. de Rossi 161.  
[Maḥzor].
- 103. ELIA B. JUDAH, [perhaps written in France], cf. ZfHB XVIII, 61 nr. 130. HB XX, 127.
- a Tebet 23, 1305: cod. Turin 3 for Menaḥem b. Ahron of  
מקדש ריינבירט St. Rambert cf. Zunz, ZG 209 Note e.  
[Proph. Priores and Posteriores].
- 104. ELIA B. JOSEPH, cf. Register 1928 p. 142. Poznanski in  
ZfHB V, 67–68. Poznanski, Einl. zu Eleasar of Beaugency,  
p. LXXVII–LXXX. Blondheim Liste p. 25 nr. 138.
- a 1268: cod. Jew. Theol. Sem. for Nathanael  
[Joseph Kara on Prophet. Priores and Posteriores].
- b 1311: cod. Cambridge Add. 376.  
[Samuel b. Jacob Gama, ערוך] cf. Buber in Graetz Fest-  
schrift (h.) p. 4. Blondheim in A. Freimann Festschrift  
p. 25 nr. 4 wrote 1411.
- 105. ELIA B. JOSEPH, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 61 nr. 132; Blondheim  
Liste p. 43 nr. 311.
- a [14th cent.] at Sabbioneta: cod. Urb. 17 Nr. 9.  
[Abraham b. Isaac ha-Levi, צפוני] cf. HB IX, 111 nr. 5.
- 106. ELIA B. JOSEPH of Sezze (מוצי), cf. ZfHB XVIII, 61 nr.  
134.
- a 1433 at Termoli: cod. de Rossi 1032 for Mordecai b. Jesaiah  
in Termoli.  
[Mishne Tora].
- 107. ELIA B. JOSEPH B. JEḤIEL DEGLI ALATRINI (מן אלטריני), cf.  
HB X, 104 nr. 11; XV, 82; H. Ueb. 132; Brüll, Jahrb. I,  
89; IX, 79; Cassuto in Enc. Jud. II, 101; Mortara, Indice  
p. 2 n. 3.
- a 1372 (?) at Macerata: cod. Paris 400 for Matatia b. Moses.  
[ס' החנוך by Ahron ha-Levi].

- b Kislev 24, 1389: cod. Parma 1386 = Perreau 9 for Moses b. David in Forli.<sup>14</sup>  
[Abraham ibn Ezra, Commentary on Pentateuch].
108. ELIA B. MESHULLAM in Fabriano and San Severino, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 61 nr. 146. Blondheim Liste p. 9 nr. 11.
- a Tammuz 20, 1421 at Fabriano: cod. Saraval 12 = Zuckermann 102 for Solomon Gedalja b. Shabbethai of San Severino.  
[Rashi on Pentateuch with additions of Isaiah di Trani].
- b Adar 15, 1422 at Fabriano: cod. Oxford 246 for Solomon Gedalja b. Shabbethai Gallico.  
[Nathan ha-Rophe מבחר המאמרים].
- c Adar 16, 1424 San Severino: cod. Oxford 1057 for Solomon י"ד b. Uziel.  
[Maḥzor Italian Rite].
- d [s. a.]: cod. Karl Hirsemann, Leipzig, Kat. 429 (1914) Nr. 1.  
[Megillot, Job with Targum and Rashi].
109. ELIA B. MOSES מלמד, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 61 nr. 144; Festschrift Hoffmann S. 281. Cassuto, Firenze 276.
- a January 9, 1438: cod. Vat. 95 for Menaḥem b. Solomon.  
[Levi b. Gershon Commentary on Job].
- b Kislev 28, 1443 at Fano: cod. Vat. 408 (Cat. p. 381) for Jannotius Manetti.  
[Josippon].
- c Kislev 2, 1444: cod. de Rossi 402 for Jekutiel b. Solomon.  
[Joseph Caspi צירור הכסף and others].
110. ELIA B. RAPHAEL HA-ROPHE b. Isaac Rophe b. Mose Rophe in Rieti, cf. Bernheimer, Paleogr. Ebr. p. 264. 278.
- a [15th cent.]: cod. Ambrosiana 36.  
[Menaḥem of Recanati's Commentary on Pentateuch].  
The copy was made by Elia b. Raphael from a codex which Jehiel b. Joab Beth-El wrote for Elia's ancestor, Moses b. Isaac.
111. ELIA ZEBI B. DAVID ibn Muallam, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 61 nr. 129.
- a Kislev 12, 1414 at Lecce: cod. Saraval 44 = Zuckermann 37 for his son the physician David.  
[Ezra Gatigno סדר ה' ליראיו].

<sup>14</sup> In Forli 1413 was written cod. Paris 1219 [Nathan b. Jehiel עירך], cf. Blondheim in Aron Freimann Festschrift p. 27 nr. 30.



- b Tebet 20, 1415 at Lecce: cod. Saraval 48 = Zuckermann 60 for his son the physician David  
[Josua ibn Shoeib מדרש התורה].
- 112. ELIEZER B. DAVID HA-LEVI ADELCHIND, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 61, nr. 152.
  - a Nisan 25, 1474: cod. de Rossi 360 for Isaac b. Meir Levi. [Jacob b. Asher, Tur 3 and 4].
  - b Sivan 5, 1479 at Piacenza: cod. Oxford 708 for Solomon b. Jehiel (?) ha-Levi.  
[Jacob b. Asher, Tur Jore Dea].
  - c Ab 16, 1479: cod. de Rossi 1180 for Solomon b. Jehiel [Tur Eben ha-Ezer].
  - d Adar 11, 1492: cod. Oxford 1124 for Joseph b. Solomon. [Common prayers].
- 113. ELIEZER B. ELIA of Padua, cf. REJ XXII, 292 [corrected in D. Kaufmann, Ges. Schriften III, 217].
  - a Tammuz 25, 1303 at St. Paolo (Toscana): cod. Oxford 2438 for Moses מלפלו in St. Paolo.  
[Collated and corrected the Pentateuch, Haphtarot and Megillot].
- 114. ELIEZER B. JEHIEL HALEFAN, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 61 nr. 161; CB 2052 (last line) and Add. and CB 2813; HB XX, 128; Delitzsch, Cat. p. 280.
  - a Tebet 10, 1469: cod. Leipzig XIII for Nathan Raphael Trabot.  
[Supercommentary on Nahmanides' Comm. on Pentateuch].
- 115. ELIEZER [or ELAZAR] B. JOSEPH ASHKENASI, see: Elazar b. Joseph חזן cf. ZfHB XVIII, 61 nr. 158.
  - a Tammuz 23, 1477 at Ascoli: cod. de Rossi 662 for Jekutiel b. Moses.  
[Haphtarot, German rite].
- 116. ELIEZER B. SAMUEL KOHEN, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 61 nr. 171.
  - a [13th cent.]: cod. de Rossi 405.  
[Maḥzor, German rite].
- 117. ELIEZER MOSES B. JOAB DI LAURIA, cf. Cassuto, Firenze 250. Rivista Israel. III, 224.

- a Elul 20, 1462: part of cod. Oxford 240 for Raphael b. Joseph Isaac.  
[Nahmanides' and Menaḥem Recanati's Comm. on Pentateuch].
118. EPHRAIM B. JOAB B. MOSES of Modena, lived at Vasto (Prov. Abruzzi) Elul 1481 (there since twenty years), he is the author of the ethical treatise *ס' המוסר* ed. Wittkower Lyck 1871 cf. *שומר ציון הנאמן* 1853 Nr. 153–158. Cf. Steinschneider Cat. Hamburg S. 157, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 62 nr. 192; Zunz, Ges. Schr. III, 175; HB XI, 103; XXI, 85; Blondheim, Liste p. 39 nr. 272.
- a Sivan 4, 1462 (?) [the year is in doubt, Zunz Litg. 619 doubts the date cf HB XI, 103, but HB XIV, 95 considered 1462 the right date]: cod. de Rossi 991.  
[Pentateuch with Targum and Rashi].
- b Kislev 10, 1463—Shebat 2, 1464: cod. Turin 104 (cf. HB XIV, 95 n. i).  
[Maḥzor rite of Rome].
- c Elul 1501 he wrote cod. Alliance Isr. 124 for Moses Nissim Israel b. Mordecai Shealtiel Israel of Bologna = cod. Schorr; cf. Zion I, 95; HB XI, 103.  
[Zidkia b. Abraham *הלקט*].
119. EPHRAIM B. MATATIA *טוצאי* ha-Zarfati, cf. Berliner, Ges. Schriften I, 114 nr. 21.
- a Kislev 26, 1481: cod. Ambrosiana 29 and 30.  
[David Kimḥi on Prophetæ Posteriores].
120. EPHRAIM B. NISSIM *תמ"ך*, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 62 nr. 195.
- a Tebet 16, 1477 in Cosenza: Kennicott 422 = Ambrosiana 16 for Moses b. Isaac of Cesena.  
[Job with Isaac Arundi' (*ארתורי*) Commentary] cf. Paris 262; Oxford 2279; Cambr. 67; cf. HB XVI, 1104.
121. HALAFTA (*סופר*) B. ABRAHAM (*סופר*) of Marseille, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 102 nr. 353; ZfHB XVII, 88 nr. 470. Carmoly, Hist. d. med. juiv. 129. Gallia Jud. 383 see: Solomon Samuel Privat.
- a Elul 4, 1434 at Mondovi: cod. Oxford 2124 for Solomon b. Joseph *ענול* Rotundo (?) cf. no. 58.  
[parts of Guilelmus Salicetus' *Chirurgia*].

- b [before 1436] at Ancona: cod. Paris 1186 for his teacher Joseph פרייר (Perier or Ferrier cf. Gallia Jud. 382).  
[Bernardus de Gordon שושן הרפואה].
122. ḤANANIAH B. MENAḤEM KOHEN, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 102 nr. 356.  
a Tammuz 8, 1474 at Sermione? (בכרך סירמוני): cod. Paris 258 for David b. Nathan.  
[Levi b. Gershon, Commentary on Canticles].
123. ḤAYYIM, cf. Blondheim, Liste p. 37 nr. 255.  
a 1486: cod. de Rossi 610 for Immanuel b. Menaḥem of Pavia.  
[Job with Rashi's Commentary].
124. ḤAYYIM B. MEIR HA-LEVI.  
a [before 1290]: cod. Paris 370 for Samuel b. Meir.  
[Moses of Coucy סמ"ג Part II].
125. ḤAYYIM B. MIKHAEL, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 102 nr. 342.  
a Tammuz 22, 1404: Br. Mus. 376 for Benjamin b. Samuel of Ancona.  
[Jacob Anatoli מלמד התלמידים].
126. ḤAYYIM B. MORDECAI ZARFATI, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 102 nr. 347.  
a Marḥesvan 1463: cod. Berlin 213 (only fol. 164–186).  
[Averroes intermed. Comm. on בעלי חיים].  
b 1476 or 1477: cod. Paris 234 for David b. Menaḥem Finzi.  
[Immanuel b. Solomon Commentary on Proverbs], cf. Dukes, Proverb. p. 48 nr. 58 (the year 1477).  
c Sivan 1, 1484 at Montalto: cod. Parma 1385 = Perreau 8 (Cat. p. 123) for Isaac Parnas Kohen.  
[Joseph Albo עקרים] cf. Sen. Sachs שירי p. 90.
127. ḤAYYIM B. NATANAEL RAPHAEL TRABOT, [his brother Menaḥem purchased cod. Turin 230, July 22, 1472, cf. Magazin II, 16] cf. Gallia Judaica 220.  
a [15th cent.] at Parma:<sup>15</sup> cod. Oxford 221.  
[Supercomm. on Abraham ibn Ezras and his longer comm. on Exodus].
128. ḤAYYIM PROVINZIALE, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 25 nr. 1543.

<sup>15</sup> Cod. Cincinnati HUC. 337 Prayerbook written in Parma (information by Wilensky).



- a Elul 3, 1454: cod. Nîmes (REJ III, 236) for Moses b. Jehiel ha-Rophe.  
[Menaḥem of Recanati, Commentary on Pent.].
- b Kislev 24, 1459: cod. Br. Mus. 882 for Moses b. Jehiel ha-Rophe in Benevento.  
[Levi b. Gershon, Supercomm. on Averroes' intermediate Comm. on Porphyry's Isagoge].
129. ḤAYYIM ISRAEL שטן רפא (STEIN-RAPA), cf. A. Freimann in *Journal of Jewish Bibliography* Vol. I (1939) p. 10.
- a Tammuz 1464 at Porto Bufalè (פורטו בופלי) (Prov. di Treviso): cod. Mantua 8 (Cat. p. 9).  
[Abraham ibn Ezra about verses in the Bible].
130. ḤAYYIM ZARFATI see: ḤAYYIM B. MORDECAI ZARFATI.
131. ḤEZEKIAH B. DAVID of Salins, (דשלינש) cf. HB XIV, 96 [perhaps a Frenchman], cf. ZfHB XVIII, 64 nr. 319. Zunz, Litg. 621.
- a Tebet 1, 1429: cod. Hamburg 196.  
[Jacob b. Asher, Tur Jore Dea].
132. ḤIYYA B. JOSEPH di Candia, cf. Lattes in Mosè II, 179; III, 283.
- a Adar II. 4, 1403 at Padua: cod. della Libreria delle Scuole Israelitiche in Venezia 4 for Abraham Rophe b. Judah Rophe [נפשו בטוב תלין חרעו יירש ארץ] (=נבח"ויא) (as in nr. 163).  
[Maimonides' Commentary on chapt. X (or XI) of Sanhedrin].
133. IMMANUEL ח'י B. ELIA, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 114 nr. 1034.
- a Elul 15, 1417 at Imola: cod. Halb. 334 = Hirschf. 505.  
[Baḥya b. Asher כד הקמה]. [The Pentateuch: cod. de Rossi 532 was written by an Immanuel in the year 1437].
134. ISAAC
- a [13th cent.]: cod. Ambrosiana 4.  
[Hagiographa].
135. ISAAC B. ABIGDOR [perhaps wrote in Spain], cf. HB XI, 103; Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 396 n. 1.
- a 1283–1284: cod. Paris 35 for Solomon b. Moses [b. Jekutiel] [Fragments of Numbers and Hagiographa (without Megillot)].

136. ISAAC B. ABRAHAM חן GRACIANO, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 107 nr. 648; *ibid.* nr. 629.  
 a [14th or 15th cent.]: cod. de Rossi 494.  
   [Nahmanides סתרי תורה].  
 b [15th cent.]: cod. de Rossi 1027.  
   [Exodus. cf. nr. c].  
 c [15th cent.]: cod. Jew. Theol. Sem.  
   [Leviticus. cf. nr. b].
137. ISAAC חן [B. ABRAHAM B. SHEALTIEL], cf. ZfHB XVIII, 107 nr. 653.  
 a [14th cent.] at Bologna: cod. Paris 1185 for Elia ha-Rophe  
 b. Shabbethai.  
   [Bernhard Gordon, שושן הרפואה] cf. H. Ueb. 785.  
 b [before 1406]: cod. Oxford 44.  
   [Pentateuch].
138. ISAAC B. ASHER KOHEN of Mantua, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 107 nr. 641.  
 a [before 1413]: cod. de Rossi 157.  
   [Levi b. Gershon, Comm. on Pentateuch].
139. ISAAC b. ELIEZER of Aix.  
 a Sivan 1239: cod. Angelica 2 (Cat. p. 88 nr. 2).  
   [Isaac Alfasi Halakhot part 2 and 3].
140. ISAAC B. ELIEZER HA-KOHEN, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 107 nr. 639.  
 a Marḥesvan 2, 1431 at Fermo: cod. Halb. 61 = Hirschfeld 213 for Joab in Fermo.  
   [סדרן Roman rite].  
 b Adar I, 1433: cod. München 117 for Abraham b. Menahem Alatrino.  
   [Mekhilta].
141. ISAAC B. JACOB ZARFATI  
 a [15th cent.] at Ancona: cod. Br. Mus. 744 for Nathanael צבע of Sovrino in Ancona  
   [Menahem of Recanati, טעמי המצות and exposition of ברכה המזון]. But the rest of the codex is written by Nathanael צבע.
142. ISAAC B. JEHIEL LOANS, [perhaps a son of Jehiel b. Meir Loans in Pavia cf. Gallia Jud. 272].

- a Kislev 12, 1493 at Ferrara: Ch. Meir Horowitz (Frankfurt a. M.) Cat. I (1883) nr. 139 = Cat. 6 (1884) nr. 112.  
[ספר על הגלגולים astronomical treatise].
- 143. ISAAC B. ISAIAH, cf. HB X, 102 n. 8.
  - a Iyyar 20, 1289: cod. Parma 3060 = Perreau 6 (Cat p. 8) (HB X, 102 nr. 8)  
[Mishne Tora book III].
- 144. ISAAC B. JOEL of Cento, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 107 nr. 664.
  - a 1461 at Cento: cod. Verona 69, cf. ZfHB XVII, 17.  
[Commentary on Lamentationes by Abraham Galante and אבן בוון by Kalonymos].
  - b [s. a.]: cod. Nationalbibl. in Wien 97B.  
[Maḥzor rite of Rome].
  - c [s. a.]: cod. Oxford 15 (cf. Add. and Corr.).  
[Prophets and Hagiographa].
  - d [s. a.]: cod. Kennicott 446 = Casanata 10.  
[Hagiographa] [wrongly dated by Sacerdote Cat. p. 484].
- 145. ISAAC B. JOSHUA HA-LEVI, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 107 nr. 663.
  - a Iyyar 1277: cod. de Rossi 463.  
[Prophet. Posteriores].
- 146. ISAAC B. JOSUA צ"ל י"ב.
  - a Tammuz 24, 1442 at Rimini for his teacher Gershon in Rimini: cod. Benzion 15.  
[Jedaja Penini אגרת בחינת עולם; Josef Ezoli כסף הקערות];
- 148. ISAAC B. MOSES b. Abragal Sefardi.
  - a Adar 8, 1469 at Naples:<sup>16</sup> cod. Urb. 7 for Shabbethai . . .  
[Psalms]
- 149. ISAAC B. NATHAN KOHEN
  - a Kislev 3, 1493 at Taranto: cod. Paris 809.  
[Joshua ibn Shoeib, Commentary on Nahmanides סחרי חורר], cf. Paris 798<sup>2</sup> cf. Cat. München 66<sup>2</sup>.
- 150. ISAAC B. NATHANAEL of Corneto Tarquinia (Prov. Rome), cf. ZfHB XVIII, 108 nr. 700.
  - a Kislev 28, 1445 at Turi: cod. de Rossi 1063.  
[Moses of Coucy סמ"ג].

<sup>16</sup> In Naples in the year 1481 a Prayer book, Italian Rite was written: cod. Jew. Theol. Sem., cf. Register 5685 p. 125.



151. ISAAC B. OBADIA b. David of Forlì in Firenze, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 108 nr. 704; Cassuto, Firenze 35. 188.
  - a Elul 13, 1427 at Bologna: cod. Br. Mus. 629 nr. XVII for Joseph b. Solomon Kohen.  
[Maḥzor Rite of Rome].
  - b July-August 1441 at Firenze: cod. Br. Mus. 626. 627 for Jacob and David sons of Solomon ירא (= Yārē?) da Perugia, cf. Cassuto, Firenze 188.  
[Maḥzor Rite of Rome]. Facsimile in Cat. Br. Mus. II tav. VIII, cf. Margoliouth in JQR XVI (1903-04), p. 73-97, cf. L. Bellcli, Sopra un libro di preghiera fiorentino del secolo XV in "Corriere Israelitico" 42, p. 165-167; 225-238.
152. ISAAC B. SHABBETHAI, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 108 nr. 709; Zunz in Benjamin of Tudela II, 22-23.
  - a [s. a.]: cod. Oxford 441 at the request of Isaac Fasi.  
[Naḥmanides, Novellae on Jebamot].
153. ISAAC B. SOLOMON, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 108 nr. 714; HB IV, 148
  - a [Elul 28, 1297] read Elul 8, 1397: Cento: cod. Almanzi 109 = Br. Mus. 628 for Joel b. Isaac.  
[Maḥzor Rite of Rome].
154. ISAAC B. SOLOMON DEL BARI (דלבארי), cf. ZfHB XVIII, 108 nr. 711. HB XVI, 41. Israel. Annalen I, 154.
  - a Adar 15. 1454 at Melfi: cod. Paris 1168 for David b. Menahem Zarfati דטריקרו da Tricoriga (Sicily).  
[Abul Qasim al-Zahrawi ס' החפץ השלם].
  - b Elul 3, 1455 at בליטה Barletta: cod. Herz Scheyer (Mainz).  
[Benjamin of Tudela, מסעות] cf. Carmoly, Hist. d. med. juiv. p. 75. 132. Carmoly, Notice sur Benjamin de Tudèle Bruxelles 1852 p. 13.
  - c 1455-56 at Viesti (בישטי) on the Adriatic sea: cod. Paris 1178. [Guilelmus de Saliceto, Chirurgia cf. H. Ueb. 802].
155. ISAAC B. SOLOMON GABLO, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 108 nr. 712; Zunz, ZG 521.
  - a Iyyar 25, 1475: cod. Vat. 341 for Moses b. Matatia חזן in Palermo.  
[Abraham ibn Daud אמונה רמה].

156. ISAAC B. SAMUEL ALATRINI.  
 a [before 1324]: cod. Alliance Isr. 49.  
 [David Kimḥi, Commentary on Isaiah].
157. ISAAC B. SAMUEL KOHEN (possibly German) cf. ZfHB XVIII, 108 nr. 719; Blondheim, Liste p. 42 nr. 301.  
 a 1273-74 [not 1473]: Kennicott 489 = Vat. 18 for Isaac b. David.  
 [Pentateuch with Targum and Rashi. Haphtarot German rite].
158. ISAAC BARUCH B. SAMUEL b. הקרוש R. Ḥayyim Zarfati of Pesaro, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 107 nr. 643.  
 a Adar 3, 1370 at Faenza: cod. de Rossi 450.  
 [Pentateuch].  
 b Ḥesvan 1387 at Rimini: cod. de Rossi 1072 for Isaac b. Leon in Rimini.  
 [Naḥmanides, Commentary on Pent.].  
 c Elul 12, 1401 at Fano: cod. de Rossi 317 for Elia b. Judah Rophe of Rome in Fano; cf. ZfHB XVII, 107 nr. 643 and 121 nr. 674.  
 [Proverbs with commentaries of Immanuel b. Solomon and an anonymous]  
 d [s. a.]: Oxford 1173<sup>2</sup> for his friends Nathan, Abraham, Moses, Samuel and David, sons of Abigdor י"ש"ר"י b. Jekutiel b. Abigdor.  
 [Moses Kimḥi מהלך].
159. ISAAC זאָרק SARK B. ZERAḤIAH, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 107 nr. 650; ZfHB XIV, 109 nr. 85.  
 a Sivan 1448 at Ferrara: cod. Paris 933 for the physician Benjamin b. Elia cf. ZfHB XVII, 80 nr. 315.  
 [Averroes intermediate Commentary on Topic].  
 b Kislev 1450: Oxford 2511.  
 [Prophiat Duran, מעשה אפור, a copy: cod. Luzzato 65 = cod. Alliance Israel. 30 (Cat. p. 19) = REJ 49, p. 274.
- 159A ISAAC מאַרלי of Arles or Marli, cod. Oxford 376: מתוקן ע"י יצחק מארלי cf. Additions and Corrections p. 1151. Cod. Oxford 879 is headed: מתוקן ע"י יצחק מארלו.  
 [Isaac of Corbeil, עמודי הגולה with R. Perez annotations]; cf. Sonne, Bulletin NY PL 46, 1942, p. 985.

160. ISAAC MENAḤEM FINZI, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 108 nr. 684.
  - a Ab 4, 1500: cod. de Rossi 969.  
[סדור].
161. ISAAC B. ABRAHAM [perhaps a Frenchman], cf. Magazin VIII, 114, erroneously 1434.
  - a 1394: cod. Halberst. 198 = Hirschfeld 6.  
[Job with an anonym. commentary].
162. ISRAEL ASHKENAZI B. AZARYAH b. MOSES, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 174 nr. 1029.
  - a Marḥesvan 22, 1450: cod. ext. de Rossi 55 = cod. Oxford 85.  
[Isaiah with David Kimḥi's commentary].
  - b Adar 18, 1453: cod. L. Loewe 8<sup>5</sup>  
[Abraham ibn Ezra, אנרת שבת], cf. H. Hirschfeld in MGWJ 38 p. 364 = James H. Loewe, A descriptive Catalogue . . . . London 1895, p. 56.
163. ISRAEL B. ELIEZER נ"ב"ת"ו"י"א [= נפשו בטוב חלין חורעו יירש ארץ], cf. U. Cassuto, Les traductions judéo-italiennes du Rituel in REJ 89 (1930), p. 265–266. U. Cassuto, Bibliografia delle traduzioni giudeo-italiane della Bibbia in Festschrift Kaminka (1937) p. 139–140.
  - a July 27: Tammuz 24, 1483 at Montalboddo: cod. Soave = cod. Br. Mus. 625 for Rebecca ח"מ"א.  
[סדור in an Italian translation].
164. JACOB B. ABRAHAM KOHEN of Lecce, cf. Magazin III, 43; ZDMG XXV, 405; Steinschneider, Supplément aux Catalogues des Manuscrits hébreux . . . de la Bibliothèque impériale (Paris 1866), Francfort-sur-le-Main 1903 p. 2 = ZfHB VI p. 86 erroneously: Isaac b. Abraham לצי.
  - a 1439 at Lecce: cod. Paris 1034 for Menaḥem of Ochrida.  
[Jacob b. Elia מבוא הגדול].
165. JACOB B. JOSEPH קיצרי (Cuzer)?
  - a Sivan 20, 1465 at Ferrara: cod. D. Kaufmann 395.  
[Judéo-German translation of prayers for ר"ה וי"כ].
166. JACOB (תלמיד הרופאים) B. MOSES ZARFATI צרפת, cf. ZfHB XVII, 140 nr. 1033.



- a Sivan 1, 1425 at San Severino on the river Potenza: cod. London, Beth ha-Midrash 42.  
[Translation of Averroes' and Themistius' commentaries by Zerahiah].
167. JACOB B. MOSES of Monselice.  
a July 25, 1393: cod. Sassoon 708 (Cat. p. 745).  
[פסקים of Isaiah b. Elia di Trani].  
b [s. a.]: cod. Sassoon 707 (Cat. p. 740).  
[פסקים of Isaiah b. Elia di Trani].
168. JACOB B. MOSES GALICO of Monselice, cf. A. Marx in Register of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America 5690, p. 154.  
a Adar II, 19: March 12, 1490 at לינינארה Linenara: cod. Jew. Theol. Sem.  
[Siddur Rite of Rome].
169. JACOB B. NATHAN of Evreux [perhaps a Frenchman], his father was the owner of cod. Cambridge 20 (Cat. p. 31), cf. ZfHB XVIII, 106 nr. 601; Gallia Jud. 43.  
a Adar 1, 1357: cod. Kennicott 50 = cod. Oxford 129 for Moses b. Samuel.  
[Megillot with Targum].
170. JACOB B. NEHEMIA b. Jacob of Lunel, cf. Brüll, Jahrbücher I, 98; II, 209; HB XVI, 132.  
a Tebet 27, . . . .: cod. Coronel 13 for Ḥayyim ha-Rophe.  
[Collections of illustrated rules of slaughtering].<sup>17</sup>
171. JACOB B. NEHEMIA SEGRÈ, cf. Blondheim, Liste p. 14 nr. 41. ZfHB XVIII, 106 nr. 598.  
a Iyyar 5, 1474: cod. Hamburg 39 for Isaac de Castello.  
[Rashi on Pentateuch].<sup>18</sup>
172. JEDIDIAH B. JERAḤMEEL  
a Tebet 17, 1401: cod. D. Kaufmann 20.  
[משכיל יבין Commentary on Pent.].

<sup>17</sup> In the colophon the scribe wrote: קאפין רושקידו Capon rostit as in the colophon of cod. Vitt. Emanuele 17 שערי אורה, cf. Berliner, Ges. Schriften I, 18 n. 10. ZfHB XI, 90 nr. 80.

<sup>18</sup> Wolf, BH III, 1041; IV, 288; Zunz, Zeitschrift p. 352 nr. 28; HB VII, 117 erroneously the year 1468.

173. JEḤIEL  
 a [15th cent.]: cod. Prag, Jüd. Gemeindebibliothek 7 (Cat. p. 12).  
 [David Kimḥi, Commentary on Prophet. Priores and Isaiah].
174. JEḤIEL B. DANIEL of Rome, cf. Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 277.  
 a 1265 [at Rome]: cod. Paris 599.  
 [Maḥzor rite of Rome].
175. JEḤIEL B. JACOB<sup>19</sup> B. JUDAH of Modena, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 106 nr. 558.  
 a Adar 26(=March 13), 1486 at Imola: L. Schwager & D. Frankel, Cat. X (Husiatyn 1906) nr. 11 for Raphael of Fano b. Uziel.  
 [Maḥzor rite of Rome].  
 b Adar 1, 1491 at Montecchio: cod. de Rossi 1146.  
 [Maḥzor].
176. JEḤIEL HA-SOFER B. JEKUTIEL b. Benjamin ha-Rophe in Rome, author of מעלות המדות, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 106 nr. 559; Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 277–278.  
 a 1268 [סליחה]; cf. Zunz in ZfHB XVIII, 106 nr. 559.  
 b Kislev 24, 1284: cod. Ambrosiana 25 for Joab Fosco b. Benjamin b. Joab.  
 [Psalms, Daniel and Ezra with commentary] cf. Magazin VII, 114=Berliner, Ges. Schriften I, 113.  
 c Ab 1287: cod. Almanzi 85c=Br. Mus. 868 for Solomon b. Moses b. Joseph.  
 [Jeḥiel b. Jekutiel מעלות המדות].  
 d Shebat 12 and Adar 25, 1289: cod. Scaliger (Leiden) 3 for Menaḥem b. Benjamin b. Menaḥem.  
 [Talmud Jerushalmi].  
 e [s. a.]: cod. Paris 674.  
 [קצור חובות הלבבות].  
 f [s. a.]: cod. Adler 2553 (Cat. p. 19)=cod. Jew. Theol. Seminary.

<sup>19</sup> Jeḥiel b. Jacob מרמבם (Del Bene) Nissan 3, 1366: cod. Gunzburg 547 for his teacher Moses Anaw, but the year 1366 is uncertain [Nathan b. Jeḥiel ערוך] cf. Blondheim in Aron Freimann Festschrift p. 26 nr. 14a.

- [Solomon b. ha-Jathom, Commentary on Mashkin, etc.]; cf. Chajes in *Rivista Israel.* III (1906) p. 181 sq. id. in *ZfHB* XI, 7.
177. JEḤIEL ROPHE B. JEKUTIEL BETH-EL, cf. Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 333; Zunz, *Ges. Schriften* III, 172.
- a 1377: cod. de Rossi 151.  
[Jeḥiel b. Jekutiel, מעלות המדות].
- b [s. a.]: cod. München 232 N. 11.  
[Fragment of a ritual compilation].
178. JEḤIEL ב' ח' B. JOAB ב' ח' OF BETH-EL, cf. *ZfHB* XVIII, 105 nr. 553; Zunz, *Ges. Schriften* III, 173 and 207; *HB* XI, 104; Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 333.
- a 1419 at Solmona: cod. de Rossi 1135 for Abraham b. Solomon Anaw.  
[Pentateuch with Rashi and Naḥmanides' Commentary], cf. Blondheim, *Liste* p. 39 nr. 276.
- b Sivan 3, 1421 at Rieti: cod. Br. Mus. 505 for Moses Rophe b. Isaac b. Baruch.  
[Maimonides, המצות ' translated by Moses ibn Tibbon].
- c Ab 3, 1422 at Rieti: cod. Oxford 1389 for Moses Rophe b. Isaac.  
[Levi b. Gershon, Commentary on Averroes' intermediate commentary on Aristote's *Physica*].
- d Ab 4, 1422: cod. Oxford 1373 for Moses Rophe b. Isaac.  
[Levi b. Gershon, Commentaries on Averroes' Paraphrase (קצור אבן רשד)]; cf. cod. Oxford 1955.
- c 1433: cod. Paris 932 for Moses b. Isaac.  
[Averroes' intermediate comm. on the two *Analyticas*].
- f Marḥesvan 1445 at Solmona: cod. de Rossi 326 for Shabbethai b. Jekutiel.  
[Abraham ibn Ezra, Commentary on Pentateuch with אור נפש by Samuel Motot].
- g [s. a.] at Rome: cod. Schönberg for Elia Beer (Fonte) b. Shabbethai.  
[Avicenna, Canon book I and II], cf. Zunz, *Ges. Schriften* III, 173.
179. JEḤIEL B. JOAB b. Jekutiel, cf. Berliner, *Ges. Schriften* I, 114 nr. 55; Bernheimer, *Paleogr. Ebr.* p. 264. 278. 394.



- a [14th cent.]: cod. Ambrosiana 28.  
[Isaiah b. Elia האחרון, Commentary on Psalms].
180. JEHIEL B. JUDAH of Ancona.  
a Febr. 5, 1371: cod. Livorno 3.  
[פסקים by Isaiah di Trani].
181. JEHIEL B. MESHULLAM.  
a Iyyar 14, 1380: cod. de Rossi 959 for Ezra b. Isaac.  
[Maḥzor rite of Rome].
182. JEHIEL מְקַיִינֶצֶן OF GENZANO B. MORDECAI HA-ROPHE of גְרוֹסֶטוֹ Grossetto, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 106 nr. 563; *ibid.* XVII, 141 nr. 1052; REJ IX, 147.  
a Sivan 1475 at Genzano: cod. Oxford 2083.  
[Hippocrates treatise "De aqua et aere" with Galenus' comm.].
183. JEHIEL B. MOSES HA-ROPHE in Polsano,<sup>20</sup> cf. ZfHB XVII, 141 nr. 1053.  
a 1358: cod. R. N. Rabinowitz 1887 nr. 120=cod. D. Kaufmann 528.  
[Collectanea: בן המלך והמיר, Shemtob ibn Palquera צרי הינן etc.].
184. JEHIEL B. SHABBETHAI in Rome, he sold the Pentateuch: cod. de Rossi 219 in the year 1389 to Matatia b. Solomon da Pisa, cf. Castelli in *Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana* XV p. 172 nr. 7; Carmoly in *Revue orientale* II, 461, Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 452.  
a [cr. 1370]: cod. Magliabechiana (III, 41, 7).  
[פליחות].
185. JEHIEL B. SOLOMON  
a Shebat 29, 1427: cod. Paris 629.  
[Maḥzor rite of Rome].
186. JEHIEL B. SOLOMON B. JOAB, cf. HB XI, 104; ZfHB XVII, 141 nr. 1056; Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 331.  
a 1330 at Rome: cod. München 111.  
[Maimonides' medical treatises].  
b Tebet 15, 1332 at Tivoli: cod. Neofiti 29.  
[Johannes Mesue junior, *Compendium medicum*].

<sup>20</sup> Jehiel b. Moses is the scribe of cod. de Rossi 481, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 106 nr. 562.

187. JEHIEL B. SAR SHALOM, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 106 nr. 566.  
 a Adar 7, 1409: cod. Oxford 590.  
 [Mishne Tora book IV–VI].
188. JEHOSHAI (יהושעיה) B. ABRAHAM b. Joseph of the family of Joseph המעוני (the Meonita), cf. ZfHB XVIII, 103 nr. 445; R. N. Rabinowitz, מאמר על הרפסת החלמוד, p. 14; Ochser in ZDMG 1909 p. 373.  
 a Shebat 11, 1381: cod. Vat. 111 for Berekhiah b. Matatia.  
 [Talmud Tractates: קדושין ונדה, יבמות].
189. JEHOSEPH B. ISAAC b. Daniel, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 103 nr. 431.  
 a Shebat 5, 1326: cod. de Rossi 854.  
 [Seder with Pirke Aboth and Psalms].
190. JEHOSEPH (יהוסף) B. SHABBETHAI זלעיץ b. Solomon לבי, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 103 nr. 430; *ibid.* XI, 91 nr. 116, Zunz in Benjamin of Tudela II, 22; Zunz, ZG 209.  
 a 1357: cod. Oxford 129 cf. nr. 239  
 [pointed the Haphtarot for Moses b. Samuel].  
 b [s. a.]: cod. Oxford 876 for his teacher Benjamin b. Solomon at Camerino.<sup>22</sup>  
 [Isaac of Corbeil סמ"ק with the glosses of R. Perez].  
 c [s. a.]: cod. de Rossi 369.  
 [Psalms, Proverbs, Job and Megilloth].  
 d [s. a.] at Camerino: cod. de Rossi 868 for his teacher Elia b. Menahem.  
 [Haftaroth and Megilloth].  
 e [s. a.]: cod. de Rossi 58 for Moses b. Nathan  
 [Immanuel's commentary on Job].
- 190A JEKUTIEL B. ABRAHAM [of Forli].  
 a [s. a.]: cod. Luzzatto 101 = cod. Alliance Isr. 44 (Cat. p. 9).  
 [סדר הפטרות Italian Rite with Lamentations and Esther] perhaps the Jekutiel b. Abraham of Forli, who sold cod. München 110 to the physician Menahem in Terni Tebet 8, 1473.
191. JEKUTIEL B. IMMANUEL of Perugia, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 109 nr. 731; Zunz, Ges. Schriften III, 174.

<sup>21</sup> לובר עולם יהיה צדיק = לעיץ Ps. 112,6 also in cod. Kennicott 554 and cod. Petersburg 78 anno 1376.

<sup>22</sup> He bought cod. de Rossi 1080 in the year 1336, cf. Cassuto, Firenze

- a Elul 1391 at Perugia: cod. de Rossi 234 for Nathanael b. Abraham in *הר בקבוק* = Monte Fiascone cf. ZfHB XIX, 140.  
[Psalms].
192. JEKUTIEL B. JEHIEL BETH-EL B. Jekutiel b. Benjamin Rophe [son of the author of *מעלות המדות*] in Rome, cf. Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 278. 333.
- a Shebat 21, 1280: cod. de Rossi 667 for his master Joab b. Benjamin b. Solomon.  
[Prophets and Hagiographa].
193. JEKUTIEL B. JEHIEL ROPHE (*אביר הרופאים*) of Beth-El b. Jekutiel *מקבציאל*, cf. Zunz Ges. Schr. III, 172.
- a Wednesday in Tammuz 1390 [erroneously 1437]: cod. Parma 1396 = Perreau 19 (Cat. p. 134) at Gubbio (*אנוביאו*) for his father-in-law Abraham in Gubbio<sup>23</sup> cf. Geiger, Wiss. Ztschr. III, 53; HB XII, 34 nr. 20.  
[Mischne Tora Vol. I and II].
- b *המשת אלפים וק"ג* = 1390 at Gubbio: cod. Casanata 52.  
[Rashi on Pentateuch] cf. Blondheim, Liste p. 41 nr. 295; Berliner, Geschichte d. Jud. in Rom II, 115.
- c 1391 at Gubbio: cod. Gunzbourg 122.  
[Megillot with Rashi and Abraham ibn Ezra's Commentary]; cf. Blondheim, Liste p. 23 nr. 119.
- d April 25, 1396 at Perugia: cod. de Rossi 180 for Nathan and Isaac, sons of Meshullam Rophe b. Abraham b. Joab of Beth-El.<sup>24</sup>  
[Nathan b. Jehiel *עריך*], cf. HB. VII, 115; Zunz Litg. 502. Colophon in: Graetz Festschrift (h.) p. 2 and Bernheimer, Paleogr. Ebr. p. 263.
- e July 21, 1401 at Perugia: cod. Paris 605 for Judah b. Jekutiel of Camerino.  
[Maḥzor rite of Rome], cf. HB XI, 105.
- f August 21, 1410: cod. Hamburg 47 for Joshua b. Benjamin. [Menaḥem of Recanati, Commentary on Pent.], cf. HB. XI, 105.

<sup>23</sup> Colophon printed in Bernheimer, Paleografia ebr. p. 267.

<sup>24</sup> Colophon *ibid.* p. 263.



- g June 8, 1415 at Perugia: cod. Sassoon 405 (Cat. p. 287) for Meshullam b. Abraham.  
[Maḥzor, rite of Rome].
- h Marḥesvan 28 = November 18, 1416: cod. Hamburg 156 for Moses b. Judah Rophe מאספילו of Spello.  
[Mishna with Maimonides' Commentary].
- i [s. a.]: cod. Oxford 1253 for Moses ha-Rophe b. Benjamin.  
[Maimonides מורה נבוכים].
- k [s. a.]: cod. de Rossi 804.  
[Maḥzor rite of Rome].
- l [s. a.]: cod. Parma 16: HB VII, 115 for Nathanael b. Abraham.  
[Maḥzor Italian rite].
194. JEKUTIEL B. JOSEPH, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 108 nr. 724.  
a Elul 20, 1386: cod. de Rossi 1006.  
[Pentateuch].
195. JEKUTIEL B. JUDAH HA-SOFER ANAW, cf. S. D. Luzzatto אורות שר"ל p. 669; Elbogen in REJ 45 p. 100; Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 458.  
a [14th cent.]: cod. Collegio rabbinico italiano, Firenze for Nathan b. Abigdor.  
[Isaac of Corbeil סמ"ק with Perez b. Elia of Corbeil רינים].
196. JEKUTIEL HA-LEVI, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 109 nr. 727.  
a Nisan 10, 1389: Prototype of cod. Oxford 1600.  
[אוצר הכבוד cabbalistic work].
197. JEKUTIEL B. MESHULLAM, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 109 nr. 728; Blondheim, Liste p. 37 nr. 259.  
a Adar 23, 1312: cod. de Rossi 682.  
[Pentateuch with Rashi and Abraham ibn Ezra's commentary].
198. JEKUTIEL B. MOSES of Rome (מרום).  
a [July 13, 1472]: cod. Paris 926 for Immanuel b. Benjamin באפיצי Apice (רחוק ו' מילי מביניינו) six miles from Benevento.  
[Averroes' Commentary on Categories etc.; Petrus Hispanus, Parva Logicalia].
199. JEKUTIEL B. SHABBETHAI.  
a [14th cent.]: cod. Nationalbibl. Wien 140 (Cat. p. 151).  
[Jehiel b. Jekutiel מעלות המדות].

200. JEKUTIEL B. SOLOMON of Bologna, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 109 nr. 732; H. Ueb. 785 n. 154.
- a Sivan 28, 1374: cod. Br. Mus. 523 for Menaḥem b. Nathan.<sup>25</sup> [פסקים Isaia di Trani].
  - b Shebat 5, 1377 at Rimini: cod. Paris 401 for Menaḥem b. Nathan in Rimini. [החינוך 'ס by Ahron ha-Levi].
  - c [s. a.] at Rimini: cod. D. Kaufmann 278 for Menaḥem b. Nathan. [Jacob Anatoli, מלמד התלמידים, cf. D. Kaufmann, Jüd. Handschriften Illustration p. 38 = Ges. Schriften III, 209.
  - d [s. a.]: cod. Paris 330 was written partly at Bologna, partly at Rimini for his teacher, the physician Joseph of Fabriano [Maimonides' Commentary on the Mishnah].
  - e [s. a.] at Rimini: Canon 87 = cod. Oxford 13 for his teacher Benjamin b. Samuel. [Bible] cf. החלוץ XI, 94.
  - f [s. a.]: cod. Paris 372 for his teacher Menaḥem b. Nathan in Rimini. [Moses of Coucy סמ"ג].
  - g [s. a.]: cod. Lipschütz (now cod. Cambridge) for Joseph ha-Rophe. [Maḥzor rite of Rome].
201. JEKUTIEL B. SOLOMON of Cortona (קורטונה), cf. Bernheimer in Studies in Memory of Freidus p. 3; A. Freimann, Manuscript Supercomm. on Rashi p. 96 nr. 82a (Repr. p. 24).
- a Ab 15, 1462 at Cortona: cod. Livorno 4. [Rashi on Pentateuch], cf. Blondheim, Liste p. 16 nr. 61
202. JERAḤMEEL B. SAMUEL, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 109 nr. 736; Wolf BH IV p. 887.
- a [s. a.]: cod. Paris 1197. [Petrocello נקיון (Purgation) and other medical treatises].
203. ISAIAH
- a [14th or 15th cent.]: cod. Hamburg 193. [Judah b. Benjamin ha-Rophe הלכות שחיטה].

<sup>25</sup> Perhaps Menaḥem b. Nathan of Rome in Rimini, cf. Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 319; Lunz לוח ארץ ישראל Vol. 2. (1895-96) p. 81; D. Kaufmann, Ges. Schriften III, 206.

204. ISAIAH B. JACOB ALUF (אלוף) da Gerona (מירונא) of Masserano (ממסראן) b. Isaiah Zarfati, cf. Steinschneider, Cat. Berlin II (1897) p. VI, ZfHB XVIII, 109 nr. 742 and 743.
- a Nisan 3, 1468: cod. Halberstam 117<sup>2</sup> = Hirschfeld 266.<sup>2</sup>  
[עלילות דברים], cf. S. J. Halberstam קהלת שלמה p. 14. 143, but Hirschfeld "written probably by the commentator (and author?) of No. 2 [= Joseph b. Meshullam].
- b Sivan 3, 1468: cod. Halberstam 117<sup>3</sup>.  
[רוח רוח attributed to either Judah or Samuel ibn Tibbon], cf. S. J. Halberstam קהלת שלמה p. 14. 143.
- c Tammuz 22, 1470 at Trino: cod. Berlin 118.  
[דייקות a grammatical treatise by Samuel, etc.] cf. Steinschneider Cat. Berlin I S. 99 sq. The colophon in Kobak לוח אגודה רבני שלאזאקייא, by L. Stein, יסודי V, 151. Partly ed. by I Tyrnau 1925, 35–67 as work of Rashbam.
- d Tebet 9, 1470 at Trino: cod. Halberstam 117 = Hirschfeld 266.  
[יסודי התורה ועמוד החכמות, Commentary on the first four chapters of Maimuni's התורה והלכות יסודי], cf. S. J. Halberstam קהלת שלמה p. 14. 143.
- e Iyyar 4, 1472 at Mantua: cod. de Rossi 660 for Baruch di Peschiera, cf. Nr. 263.  
[מורה נבוכים, Maimonides].
- f Nisan 6, 1477 at Lucera: cod. Oxford 1277<sup>5</sup> for Baruch di Peschiera b. Samuel.<sup>26</sup>  
[Isaac b. Abraham ibn Latif, Philosophical treatises], cf. Steinschneider in Festschrift für Abr. Berliner, p. 351.
- g Kislev 8, 1481 at Mantua: cod. Ambrosiana 32 for [Matatia]? b. Nathan.  
[En Solomon Astruc, מדרשי התורה], cf. Magazin VII, 115 = Berliner, Ges. Schriften I, 114 nr. 149, published from this cod. by S. Eppenstein, Berlin 1899.

<sup>26</sup> For Samuel di Peschiera is written at Mantua 1491 בעל הלשון Hebr. Lexicon: cod. Bibl. Nation. in Madrid (Gg nr. 109), cf. Hartwig Dérenbourg, Notices critiques sur les manuscrits arabes de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Madrid Paris 1904 p. 50; Poznanski in MGWJ. 50 S. 62; Schwab in REJ 49, p. 317. Baruch b. Samuel of Peschiera, cf. Gallia Jud. 447.



- h Shebat 19, 1481 at Mantua: cod. Oxford 1071 for Solomon Jedidiah b. Israel of San Severino.  
[Compendium of Maḥzor rite of Rome].
- i Sivan 26, 1482 at Mantua: cod. de Rossi 78 for Samuel Maffola (?).  
[David Kimḥi, Commentary on Ezekiel].
- k Shebat 13, 1482 at Mantua: cod. D. Kaufmann 294 for Baruch di Peschiera.  
[נכות אדם], cf. Mortara, Indice, p. 49.
- l Adar II 9, 1482 at Mantua: cod. Parma 1392 = Perreau 15 for Baruch b. Samuel di Peschiera.  
[Sohar on Genesis], cf. HB XII, 31 nr. 16.
- m March 2, 1483 (not 1503): cod. Parma 1420 = Perreau 43 for Eliezer b. Samuel of Cesena.  
[Solomon b. Samuel פתחי עולם], cf. HB XII, 117, cf. cod. Parma 1392.
- n Tebet 15, 1484 at Mantua: cod. Coronel<sup>27</sup> = cod. Oxford 2381 for Moses b. Judah of Trani.  
[The Hebrew translation of Honein's Introduction (מבוא)].
- o Tammuz 20, 1485: cod. Halberstam 216 = Hirschfeld, 45.  
[Eliezer Sopino נופת צופים], cf. Magazin VIII, 111; Kobak ישרון V, 151.
- p Iyyar 2, 1486 at Mantua: cod. Oxford 2295.  
[Abraham ha-Levi מנלת אמרפל].<sup>28</sup>
- q Kislev 10, 1488 at Mantua: cod. Br. Mus. 485 for Moses b. Saul ha-Levi.  
[Mishne Tora].
- r Sivan 22, 1489 at Mantua: cod. de Rossi 6 for Menaḥem b. Isaac of Revere.  
[Pentateuch with Targum and Rashi], cf. Blondheim, Liste p. 34 nr. 221; Zunz, ZG. 217 nr. 19; 219 nr. 27.
- s Iyyar 27, 1496 at Mantua: Vocalisation in cod. Paris 50 for Daniel b. Judah da Norcia, cf. Blondheim, Liste p. 32 nr. 198.

<sup>27</sup> Sold in the year 1871, cf. Steinschneider, Cat. Hamburg S. 142 n. 1.

<sup>28</sup> Tishri 14, 1487 at Mantua MS of מנחת יהודה, cf. דעת זקנים, Livorno 1783 f. 90a, cf. Zunz, ZG 220.

- t [after 1464] the second part (Numeri etc.) of cod. Turin 31, cf. *Magazin* II, 16.  
[Nahmanides, Commentary on Pentateuch].
- u [s. a.]: cod. de Rossi 630 for David b. Isaac of Revere.  
[Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Esther and Ruth with Levi b. Gershon's Commentary].
205. ISAAH B. MOSES, cf. *ZfHB* XVIII, 109 nr. 744.  
a Tammuz 2, 1266 at Salerno: cod. de Rossi 422.  
[Mishne Tora books IV–VI].
- 205A ISAAH B. MOSES B. SOLOMON, cf. *ZfHB* XVIII, 109 nr. 745.  
a Tishri 5, 1425: cod. de Rossi 106 for Abraham b. Menaḥem.  
[Moses b. Solomon of Salerno, Commentary on More Nebukhim].
206. JOAB בִּנְיָמִן B. BENJAMIN b. Joab at the age of fifteen years, cf. *ZfHB* XVIII, 103 nr. 448; *HB* XI, 104; Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 333.  
a Tammuz 28, 1366 at Perugia: cod. Beth ha-Midrash (Jews' College) London 48.  
[Jeḥiel b. Jekutiel מעלות המדות].
207. JOAB B. JEḤIEL BETH-EL, cf. *ZfHB* XVIII, 103 nr. 450.  
a 1309: cod. de Rossi 1100 for Mordecai b. Joab.  
[Jacob Anatoli מלמד התלמידים], cod. München 327 "probably from copies of Joab b. Jeḥiel [cf. *HB* XI, 103; Zunz, *Ges. Schriften* III, 175 (169)] of the year 5069 . . . identical with the copyist of cod. de Rossi 1100 cf. Zunz in Geiger wiss. Ztschr. III, 55 . . . and the Roman poet, ridiculed by Immanuel Romi, cf. Zunz, *Litg.* 501. 709." *HB* VII, 115; XI, 103; XIV, 61; Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 333, Luzzatto מבוא 23; Landshut עמורי העבודה 81.
- b 1321 at Rome "as messenger at the court"<sup>29</sup>: cod. Gunzbourg I, 255.  
[סדר Italian rite].

<sup>29</sup> Steinschneider [cf. *Ltbl. d. Orient* IV, 197; *HB* X, 100 n. 1; XI, 54; XIX, 118; Steinschneider, *Ges. Schriften* I, 198 n. 16] believed that the "messenger at the court" was Kalonymos b. Kalonymos, followed by Graetz VI, 303; VIII, 407. But Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 307 n. 2: "wahrscheinlich war Joab Bethel, der Dichter und Schreiber, der Bote."

208. JOAB B. JEḤIEL ROPHE Beth-El of Todi b. Jekutiel, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 103 nr. 446 and nr. 451; *ibid.* 104 nr. 452, Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 333; ZfHB XVII, 145 nr. 1136.
- a 1399–1401 at Cesena: codd. Paris 328. 329 for Jeḥiel b. Joseph Della Rocca.  
[Maimonides, Commentary on the Mishna].
- b 1401–1402 at Cesena: cod. Biblioth. Nazionale in Firenze for Jeḥiel b. Moses of הר פרה Monte Fiorito (Prov. Forli) cf. Zunz, *Ges. Schriften* III, 209.  
[Mishna], cf. Chajes in *Rivista Israel*. V, 75 sq.; Cassuto in *Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana* XXI, 309 sq.
- c Kislev 1402: cod. Nationalbibliothek in Wien 9 (Cat. p. 9) for Jeḥiel b. Moses of Monte Fiorito.  
[Pentateuch with Targum].
- d 1404: cod. Asher 13 = Levy 112 for Jeḥiel b. Moses.  
[חובות הלכבות ושכלי הלקט], cf. HB XI, 104.
- e [s. a.]: cod. Vat. 462, cf. H Ueb 788 Anm. 172.  
[Bruno de Longoburga, *Chirurgia Magna*]
- f [s. a.] at Rieti: cod. de Rossi 197 in collaboration with his son Jeḥiel cf. Zunz *Ges. Schriften* III, 173.  
[Pentateuch and Haftarot].
- g [s. a.]: cod. de Rossi 1100 cf. Cat. München 2 Aufl. S. 178 and Nr. 207; ZfHB XVIII, 103 nr. 446.  
[Jacob Anatoli, מלמד התלמידים]
209. JOAB B. MENAḤEM JOSEPH, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 104 nr. 453; Zunz, *Ges. Schriften* III, 175.
- a Shebat 25, 1460: cod. de Rossi 1371 for Jekutiel b. Nathan.  
[a Version of Judah Romano's treatises].
210. JOAB אַנא ה' מלטה נפשי = א' מ' ן Ps. 116,4, cf. Zunz, *Ges. Schriften* III, 207, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 103 nr. 447.
- a [in the beginning of the 15th cent.]: cod. Oxford 2219.  
[Judah ibn Tibbon's ethical letter addressed to his son Samuel].
211. JOEL B. [JOSEPH] פורת יוסף [probably the scribe of the anonymous commentary on בחינת עולם printed at Soncino 1484].
- a [s. a.]: cod. Casanata 160<sup>3</sup>.  
[Jedaiah Penini בחינת עולם].



212. JOEL B. SIMEON, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 104 nr. 456; HB IV, 122.  
 a Kislev, 1269: cod. Almanzi 67 = Br. Mus. 615 for Menaḥem  
 b. Samuel and his daughter Maraviglia.  
 [סדר רite of Rome].
213. JOEL B. SIMEON ASHKENAZI, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 104 nr. 455.  
 a Elul 25, 1485 at Modena: cod. de Rossi 204 for Immanuel  
 b. Isaac in Modena.  
 [Psalms with David Kimḥi's commentary].  
 b [s. a.] at Cremona: cod. Turin 63 for Abraham b. Jacob and  
 his wife Hannah bat Isaiah ha-Sofer.  
 [Maḥzor German rite].
214. JOEL B. SIMON, called Feibush Ashkenazi, cf. ZfHB XI, 91  
 nr. 101. 102; Italiener, Darmstädter Hagada p. 197 and 281  
 n. 2. A Marx in Studies p. 261–63 and 269; M. Fooner in  
 JQR NS XXVII, 217–32; Landsberger in HUCA. XVIII,  
 291. 293.  
 a 1454 [Haggadah].  
 bc two Haggadahs in Jew. Theol. Sem. cf. Register 1938 p. 70.  
 d Nürnberg, Germanisches Museum 2107 N. 6.  
 [Haggadah]  
 e Br. Mus. 615.  
 [Haggadah]  
 f Washington, Library of Congress.  
 [Haggadah]
215. JOHANAN FARRISOL of Montpellier, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 104  
 nr. 463; תיקון מנחם ed. Schwarz I p. XVI; II p. 125.  
 a Elul 1410: cod. Angelica I N. 9 (Cat. p. 86).  
 [Moses Kimḥi, Commentary on Job].
216. JOMTOB B. ISAAC, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 104 nr. 466; Blondheim,  
 Liste p. 34 nr. 225.  
 a Tishri 4, 1310: cod. de Rossi 12 for Ahron b. Levi.  
 [Pentateuch with Targum and Rashi].
218. JONATHAN B. ABIESER HA-KOHEN of Ferrara in Rome, cf.  
 Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 278.  
 a Iyyar 12, 1284 at Ferrara: cod. Paris 763.  
 [ס' יצירה].  
 b 1294 at Rome: cod. Turin 76 for Jehiel b. Zidkia in Rome.  
 [Averroes, explanation of Aristoteles שמע הטבעי].

- c [s. a.] at Rome: cod. Br. Mus. 756.  
[Excerpts from Nahmanides' Commentary on Pentateuch etc.].
219. JOSEPH B. ABBA NATHAN b. Samuel Zarfati di Trani, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 104 nr. 476.  
a Sivan 1, 1484: cod. de Rossi 892 for Mordecai b. Abraham Kohen in Naples.  
[Pentateuch, Megillot and Haphtarot].
220. JOSEPH B. ABRAHAM.  
a 1417: cod. Paris 612 for Nathan b. Samuel.  
[part I of Maḥzor rite of Rome].
221. JOSEPH בֶּן קָהֵב [= קרנו תרום בכבוד Ps. 112,9, cf. Zunz, Ges. Schriften III, 210] b. DANIEL B. ELIA b. Uziel.  
a Kislev 28, 1406: cod. Paris 750.  
[Maimonides, שְׁמֹנֶה עָרָבִים].
222. JOSEPH B. DAVID, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 104 nr. 489; HB. V, 55.  
a Tammuz 3, 1273: cod. Almanzi 26=cod. Br. Mus. 168 for Benjamin b. Isaac.  
[Rashi on Pentateuch].
223. JOSEPH (BEN?) DAVID of Rome, cf. Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 332.  
a Iyyar 28, 1336 at Rome: cod. München 143 for Nissim b. David חֲנִיךְ  
[Maimonides, מִשְׁנֵה תוֹרָה Book III].
224. JOSEPH B. ELIA  
a 1369: cod. Adler 399 (Cat. p. 53)=cod. Jew. Theol. Semin.  
[Abraham ibn Ezra, יְסוֹד מוֹרָא].
225. JOSEPH GALLICO, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 104 nr. 485.  
a Tebet 23, 1498: cod. de Rossi 937.  
[Samuel Almosnino, Supercomm. on Rashi's Comm. on Pent.] [Iyyar 1508 Joseph Gallico wrote cod. de Rossi 505].
226. JOSEPH NAKDAN B. ISAAC, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 105 nr. 524.  
a Adar 1, 1299: cod. Kennicott 136=cod. Oxford 2325 for Samuel b. Moses ha-Levi at קְרוֹנוֹיָא.  
[Pentateuch with Targum, Megillot and Haphtarot (illuminated)].
227. JOSEPH B. ISRAEL הַשְּׁלִיט.  
a Adar 8, 1463: cod. Oxford 1319.  
[Maimonides, מִלּוֹת הַהֲגִיִּין].

228. JOSEPH B. JACOB SEFARDI in Bologna, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 104 nr. 504.  
 a Tammuz 26, 1479: cod. de Rossi 136 for Eliezer of Norzi.  
 [Joseph Albo עקרים].  
 b [15th cent.]: cod. Nationalbibliothek in Wien 162<sup>2</sup> (Cat. p. 173) for Solomon Kohen-Porto.  
 [Judah Messer Leon, Commentary on Prophyry's Isagoge].
229. JOSEPH B. JOAB ELIA, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 104 nr. 497; Zunz, Ges. Schriften III, 175  
 a Iyyar 10, 1461: cod. de Rossi 215 for Daniel.  
 [Psalms].
230. JOSEPH B. JUDAH ha-Sofer Ashkenazi.  
 a Elul 24, 1406: cod. Mantua 82 (Cat. p. 63) for Menahem b. Jehiel.  
 [Zidkia b. Abraham שבלי הלקט].
231. JOSEPH MARCELLI (מרצילי) B. ḤAYYIM  
 a Sivan 28, 1421: cod. Oxford 2098.  
 [Avicenna, Canon part I].
232. JOSEPH B. MESHULLAM wrote cod. Halberstam 117 = Hirschfeld 266 according to Hirschfeld. But Halberstam קהלת שלמה p. 14 and 143] believes, that the scribe is: Isaiah b. Jacob [Aluf] of Maserano, see: Isaiah b. Jacob [Aluf] of Maserano nr. 204.
233. JOSEPH B. MOSES, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 105 nr. 519.  
 a [14th cent.]: cod. de Rossi 1299 for Moses of Monreal.  
 [Rashi's Commentary on Talmud tractates].
234. JOSEPH B. NATHAN, cf. Blondheim, Liste p. 18 nr. 83.  
 a Adar 13, 1257: Br. Mus. 189 N. II for Simson b. Judah.  
 [Rashi on Prophets].
235. JOSEPH B. NATHAN B. ISRAEL ZARFATI.  
 a Sivan 13, 1481 at Naples: cod. Jew. Theol. Sem. for Mordecai b. Judah of Rome.  
 [Maḥzor, Roman rite].  
 cf. Schloss, Cat. Hodgson & Co., 1918 nr. 502.
236. JOSEPH B. NEHEMIAH FOA, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 105 nr. 521; H. Ueb. 475.



- a Iyyar 1476 at Sinigaglia: cod. Steinschneider 12 = cod. Jew. Theol. Sem. for Pinḥas ha-Rophe b. Nathanael cf. ZfHB XVIII 33 nr. 1691.  
[Raimundus Lullus, "Ars brevis" (מלאכת קצרה)].
- b [15th cent.]: cod. Br. Mus. 917.  
[Petrus Hispanus מהניון טראטאטו].
237. JOSEPH B. SHABBETHAI.  
a 1410: cod. Oxford 2903.  
[a Kabbalistic apocalyptic work].
238. JOSEPH B. SHABBETHAI of Modena.  
a [s. a.] supplied the beginning of the preface and the end of the index of Zidkia Anaw's שבלי הלקט in cod. Oxford 659.
239. JOSEPH B. SHABBETHAI NAKDAN cf. nr. 190.  
a 1357 pointed the Haphtarot in cod. Oxford 129 for Moses.  
[Megillot and Haphtarot].
240. JOSEPH B. SAMUEL of Rossena (near Parma), cf. ZfHB XVIII, 105 nr. 546.  
a Tishri 15, 1492: cod. Nationalbibliothek in Wien 95 (Cat. p. 97).  
[סדרור rite of Rome].
- b Sivan 2, 1497: cod. Parma 3493 = Perreau 14 (Cat. p. 50), cf. HB VII, 135 nr. 18.  
[Maḥzor rite of Rome].
241. JOSEPH B. SAMUEL HA-SEFARDI.  
a Elul 16, 1469: cod. Paris 741 for David of Tivoli.  
[Joseph Albo ס' העקרים].
242. JOSEPH HA-SOFER HA-SEFARDI, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 105 nr. 527.  
a Tebet 23, 1489 at בוטונטי Bitonto in Apulia: cod. Oxford 1346 for Menaḥem b. Abraham לבית מאיר during his stay במדרשו of R. Moses Ḥabib. To be added to Marx, Studies, p. 432.  
[כוונות הפילוסופים with Moses Narboni's commentary].
243. JOSEPH JUDAH B. JEḤIEL מילנסי (?) [Milanese]?  
a [s. a.]: cod. Reggio = Schorr = Steinschneider = cod. Berlin 117.  
[supplied Immanuel b. Solomon's Commentary on Canticles].

244. JOSHUA, cf. Blondheim, Liste p. 28 nr. 171.
  - a [15th cent.]: cod. Oxford 191.  
[Rashi on the Pentateuch].
245. JOSHUA B. ABRAHAM HA-LEVI, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 103 nr. 434.
  - a Sivan 15 to Ab 24, 1404: cod. de Rossi 803 for Elia b. Zidkia.  
[Isaac of Corbeil, סמ"ק].
246. JOSHUA B. DAVID KOHEN, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 103 nr. 438 = ZfHB XVIII, 109 nr. 739.
  - a Ab 19, 1452: cod. Nationalbibliothek Wien 174 (Cat. p. 191) for Abraham de Balmes cf. ZfHB XVII, 17.  
[Compendium of the Alexandrines from Galens' works].
  - b Tammuz 29, 1455 at Lecce: cod. Saraval 3 = Zuckermann 93 for Abraham de Balmes cf. Perles, Beiträge p. 194; ZfHB XVII, 17, S. Krauss in MGWJ. 73 (1929) 385–403. 451–463. Blondheim in Aron Freimann Festschrift p. 25 nr. 3.  
[Nathan b. Jehiel, Aruch].
  - c Marḥesvan 22, 1468 at Gallipoli (Prov. Lecce): cod. Nikolsburg V = Boston, Medical Library 10.  
[Bernard de Gordon, Lilium medicinae] cf. HUeb. 785 Add.; MGWJ 37 p. 235, cf. A. Z. Schwarz in Freidus Memor. Vol. p. 179–81; Gilhofer & Ranschburg Auction XIII, Luzern 1934 p. 96 nr. 474. James F. Ballard, Catalogue of the medieval and renaissance Manuscripts and Incunables in the Boston Medical Library Boston 1944.
  - d Nisan 3, 1471: cod. Ratsbibliothek Leipzig 26.  
[Gazzali הפילוסופים כוונות], cf. Wolf, B. H. IV, 745.
  - e Elul 9, 1473: cod. Br. Mus. 885.  
[Averroes' intermediate commentary on Aristotle's Physics].
  - f Iyyar 28, 1478 at Lecce: cod. Verona 60 for Abraham de Balmes.  
[Jacob b. Asher, טור חושן המשפט], cf. ZfHB XVII, 17.
  - g Kislev 15, 1482 at Lecce: cod. de Rossi 1345.  
[Avicenna, Canon lib. II].
  - h according to A. Z. Schwarz, Cat. Nationalbibliothek Wien, p. 191 part of cod. Berlin 236.  
[Hippocrates, Aphorisms with Galen's commentary].

247. JOSHUA B. GERSHOM, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 103 nr. 437.  
 a Elul 14, 1486: cod. Kennicott 561 = Padua Jew. Community for his son Gershom.  
 [Pentateuch with Targum, Haphtarot and Megillot with Rashi's commentary], cf. Blondheim, Liste p. 31 nr. 194a.
248. JOSHUA B. JOSHUA [perhaps a German cf. ZfHB XI, 92 nr. 121], cf. ZfHB XVIII, 103 nr. 440.  
 a Iyyar 7, 1465: cod. Kennicott 436 = cod. Casanata 12 for Elia ha-Rophe b. Isaac.  
 [Pentateuch, Haphtarot and Megillot].  
 b Elul 8, 1478: cod. Casanata 22 for Solomon b. David Kohen.  
 [Pentateuch, Haphtarot and Megillot].
249. JOSHUA B. SOLOMON ש ר א, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 103 nr. 443; Geiger, Jüd. Ztschr. IX, 190.  
 a Tebet 7, 1350 at Fano: cod. de Rossi 741.  
 [Ahron ha-Levi, אהרן הכהן].
250. JOSHUA MEIR B. ISAAC of Cremona, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 103 nr. 442.  
 a Tebet 20, 1480 at Cremona: cod. de Rossi 453.  
 [Levi b. Gershon, Commentary on Pent.].
251. JUDAH IN ROME, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 102 nr. 364; Zunz, Ges. Schriften III, 179, Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 331.  
 a Nisan-Iyyar 1312 at Rome: cod. de Rossi 728.  
 [Benjamin b. Judah, Commentary on Proverbs].
252. JUDAH א"י יזיי"א.  
 a 1432: cod. Oxford 2276.  
 [Pharez האלהות מערכת].
253. JUDAH AHRON, cf. Modona, Catalogo dei cod. ebr. p. 332; O. Guerrini, Codici e libri preziosi rinvenuti nella R. Biblioteca dell' Università di Bologna. In "Bolletino ufficiale dei Ministero della pubblica istruzione," 1883, vol. XI, p. 72. Cf. REJ VI, 291.  
 a [13th cent.]: cod. Bologna 9 (Cat. p. 332).  
 [David Kimhi, Commentary on Isaiah and Jeremiah].
254. JUDAH B. BENJAMIN ANAW in Rome, cf. Berliner, Geschichte d. Jud. in Rom II, 1 p. 116; Vogelstein u. Rieger I.  
 a 1247: cod. Paris 312 for Solomon b. Elia.  
 [Isaac Alfasi, Halakhot].



255. JUDAH B. BENJAMIN in Rome, cf. Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 276 note 10.  
 a [after 1330]: the greater part of cod. Oxford 221.  
 [Abraham ibn Ezra, Commentary on Pent.]
256. JUDAH B. BENJAMIN ROPHE in Rome, cf. J. Millas Valli-crosa, *Manuscriptos Hebraicos en Toledo in Al-Andalus*. Vol. II, 1934, p. 411.  
 a 1313 at Rome: cod. Zelada = cod. Toledo 10.  
 [Maḥzor rite of Rome].
257. JUDAH B. BENJAMIN B. JUDAH b. Benjamin Finzi, cf. CB. 1298; HB IV, 121; Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 378.  
 a [14th or 15th cent.]: cod. Almanzi 66 = cod. Br. Mus. 526.  
 [Judah Ya'aleh b. Benjamin ha-Rophe, הלכות שחיטה והלכות טריפה].
258. JUDAH B. ELEAZAR.  
 a Elul 16, 1440: cod. Hamburg 264.  
 [ביאור השמע הטבעי] Averroes' intermediate comm. on *Physica* transl. by Kalonymos b. Kalonymos].
259. JUDAH B. ISAAC, cf. Zunz, ZG. 208; Zunz, Litg. 490.  
 a \* [cr. 1295]: cod. Nimes 13721; cf. REJ III, 231 for Joab b. Benjamin [in Rome].  
 [Mishne Tora].
260. JUDAH B. ISAAC ZARFATI, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 103 nr. 401.  
 a March 24, 1409: cod. de Rossi 774 for Jehiel b. Mordecai.  
 [Proverbs with Immanuel b. Solomon's commentary].
261. JUDAH B. JACOB in Rome, cf. Steinschneider in *Berliner Ges. Schriften* I, 226, Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 262. 341.  
 a wrote at Rome as pupil of Rabbi Joab cod. Paris 976.  
 [Samuel ibn Tibbon יקוה המים]. See Marx Studies 432.
262. JUDAH B. JACOB of Vermenton איש חיל, cf. R. N. Rabinowitz, דקדוקי סופרים Vol. II App. Brüll, *Jahrbücher* I, 99. REJ VII, 74; Gallia Jud. 208; *Ecrivains* 409.  
 a 1392: cod. Halberstam = cod. Oxford 2696 for Joseph b. Matatia Treves.  
 [ס' הנייר].
263. JUDAH B. MEIR RAPHAEL, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 103 nr. 402.

- a Sivan 4, 1472 at Mantua: cod. de Rossi 660 for Baruch b. Samuel of Peschiera, cf. cod. Oxford 1277 cf. Nr. 204f.  
[Maimonides' מורה נבוכים].
264. JUDAH B. MENAHEM SOFER, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 103 nr. 404.  
a Ab 4, 1304: cod. Kennicott 564 for Gershon b. Eliezer.  
[Pentateuch with Targum, Megillot and Haphtarot].
265. JUDAH SOFER B. MORDECAI, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 103 nr. 405.  
a [14th cent.]: cod. de Rossi 95 for Judah b. Solomon.  
[Judah b. Benjamin, הלכות בדיקה].
266. JUDAH B. SOLOMON JEDIDIAH dei Finzi of Camerino, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 103 nr. 420; MGWJ 1853 p. 437, Cassuto, Firenze 261.  
a Kislev 29, 1439: cod. Sussex 12.  
[David Kimḥi on Psalms, Levi b. Gershon on Job, and Zerahiah b. Shealtiel on Proverbs], cf. Thomas J. Pettigrew, Vol. I p. XXIV nr. 12.  
b Shebat 10, 1449: cod. Saraval 7=Zuckermann 10 for Abraham b. Abraham di Norzi.  
[wrote the Vocalisation, Targum and Rashi in the Pentateuch codex].  
c Tishri 26, 1454: cod. Parma 1380=Perreau 3 for Leon Gabriel.  
[Rashi on Pentateuch], cf. Blondheim, Liste p. 40 nr. 280.
267. JUDAH B. SOLOMON of Camerino [perhaps the same as the previous nr. 266, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 103 nr. 417; Brüll, Jahrbücher IX, 63, Cassuto, Firenze 261.  
a Elul 17, 1472 at Lucera de' Saraceni: cod. Paris 1280 for the physician Raphael Kohen of Lunel in Manfredonia cf. ZfHB XVIII, 35 nr. 1720.  
[Joseph b. Gorion, Josippon].
268. JUDAH B. SOLOMON מלמד, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 103 nr. 422; Zunz, ZG. 220.  
a Elul 29, 1486: cod. de Rossi 94.  
[Psalms].
269. JUDAH B. SOLOMON b. Shabbethai Levi, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 103 nr. 421; Zunz in Benjamin of Tudela II, 22.  
a Kislev 16, 1493 at Ispino (Spigno Monferrato?): cod. de Rossi 1167.  
[Joshua Lorki medical treatises].

- b Kislev 26, 1493 at אישפּינו Ispino (Lombardy): cod. de Rossi 1168.  
[Meir Alguadez, *Practica remedia*].
270. JUDA AHRON B. BENJAMIN ו'א"ב.  
a Iyyar 10, 1471: cod. Neofiti 20 for Solomon b. Immanuel de' Lancieri or delli Panzieri.  
[David Kimḥi שרשים].
271. JUDA SEGRÈ, cf. HB VII, 117.  
a Nisan 1, 1473: cod. Perreau 23, cf. HB VII, 117 for Samuel [המקובל].  
[Rashi on Isaac Alfasi, *Halakhot*].
272. KALONYMOS B. DAVID KALONYMOS, cf. *Encycl. Jud.* III, 1077.  
a February 3, 1494 at Bari: cod. de Rossi 336.  
[Collection of astronomical treatises partly written by Kalonymos' brother].
273. KALONYMOS B. ISAAC B. MEIR b. Jekutiel, cf. *ZfHB* XVIII, 115 nr. 1058.  
a Iyyar 1408 at פרלארה: cod. de Rossi 616.  
[Maimonides, משנה חורה].
274. KALONYMOS B. JEKUTIEL LEVI ZARFATI in Rome, cf. *ZfHB* XVIII, 115 nr. 1057; Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 277.  
a 1230 at Rome: cod. Paris 682.  
[Maimonides, More transl. by Judah Ḥarizi].
275. LEON B. JOAB OF BETH-EL, cf. *ZfHB* XVIII, 110 nr. 773; Zunz, *Ges. Schriften* III, 171.  
a 1353: cod. Laurent. Pl. 88 cod. 55 N. 6 (Cat. p. 545).  
[ס' המליצה], cf. H. Ueb. 94.
276. LEON [JUDAH] b. JOSHUA DE ROSSI of Cesena, cf. *ZfHB* XVIII, 109 nr. 772; HB XII, 108.  
a November 15, 1465: cod. Br. Mus. 629 N. 16. for Joab Immanuel of Reggio, cf. HB XII, 107 sq.  
[Abot and other parts of cod. Br. Mus. 629].
- b [cr. 1451]: cod. Turin 218 for Zakhariah b. Benjamin Finzi.  
[חולדות אלכסנדר].
277. LEVI B. AHRON, cf. *ZfHB* XVIII, 109 nr. 765.  
a [14th. cent.]: cod. de Rossi 1299 for Moses of Monreal.  
[Rashi's Commentary on tractates of the Talmud Babli].



278. LEVI B. AHRON ḤALFAN<sup>30</sup> [not b. Abraham as Wolf BH IV, 962], cf. ZfHB XVIII, 109 nr. 766; Zunz, Ges. Schriften III, 11, Sonne in HUCA XVI, 53. About the family Ḥalfan, cf. ZfHB XI, 89 nr. 71; CB 2813–14; Wachstein, Die Inschriften des alten Judenfriedhofes in Wien. Bd. 1 p. 60 sq.
- a Kislev 4, 1476: cod. Oxford 658 for Joseph.  
[Zidkia Anaw שבלי הלקט Part II].
- b 1489: J. Kauffmann, Kat. 66 nr. 1758, cf. my description; W. H. Schab N. Y. (formerly Gilhofer & Ranschburg in Vienna) offered this MS to the NYPL, May 1943.  
[The Hebrew Bible with illuminations, made at Florence].
- c Adar 12, 1494: cod. Sassoon 534 (Cat. p. 193) for . . . b. Eliezer.  
[Mordecai b. Hillel הגדול מרדכי].
- d [s. a.]: cod. Kennicott 104 = cod. Br. Mus. 182.  
[Pentateuch with Targum and Rashi's Commentary], cf. Blondheim, Liste p. 18 nr. 76.
- e [s. a.]: cod. de Rossi 11.  
[Pentateuch with Targum, Megillot and Haphtarot, Job with commentary of Joseph Kara, (cf. Berliner, Ges. Schriften I, 92) and Proverbs, cf. Blondheim, Liste p. 34 nr. 224 note 5.
- f [s. a.]: cod. de Rossi 801 for Abraham and his son Solomon.  
[Hagiographa].
- g [15th cent.]: cod. Paris 114 for Abraham b. Joseph Kohen in Alessandria.  
[Psalms.] The Nakdan was Nethanael טרבוט Trabotto, cf. cod. de Rossi 7 and 1050 see: ZfHB XVIII, 114 nr. 1000 [in the year 1475].
279. LEVI B. NETHANAEAL TRABOTTO (טרבוט), צדיק באמונתו יהיה = צ'ב' (Habakkuk 2,4, cf. Zunz, ZG. 363,) cf. כ"ח VIII, 170 n. 1; Gross, Gallia Jud. 221.
- a 1476 at רבייל (Revello)<sup>31</sup>: cod. Paris 390.  
[Isaac of Corbeil סמ"ק].
- b [s. a.] The *Nakdan* of cod. Paris 114 see nr. 278g.  
[Psalms] cf. cod. Paris 148.

<sup>30</sup> His son: Mordecai in Ancona; see: Mordecai b. Levi Ḥalfan nr. 333.

<sup>31</sup> At רבייל Menaḥem b. David Trabotto sold 1471 a Maḥzor, rite of France: cod. Oxford 2502 to his relative Nathanael.

280. MANOAH B. MORDECAI, cf. ZfHB XVIII 111 nr. 818.  
 a 1310 at דִּיגְנָא Digna: cod. Turin 75 for Leon סִיני of Cologne,<sup>32</sup> cf. REJ IX, 145 n. 1; Gallia Jud. 155.  
 [Biblia], cf. HB XX, 129 n. 6.  
 b Marhesvan 1315: cod. Oxford 603 for Samuel b. Shalom. [Mishne Tora VIII to XIV].  
 c [before 1323]: cod. Paris 347 for Abraham b. Shemtob. [Mishne Tora VIII to XIV].
281. MATATIA,<sup>33</sup> cf. Berliner in Magazin II, 5.  
 a [before 1421]: cod. Kennicott 525 = cod. Bologna 6. [Pentateuch, Hagiographa and Prophets].
282. MATATIA B. GERSHON [is this scribe Italian?], cf. ZfHB XVIII, 113 nr. 968.  
 a Adar 1444: cod. de Rossi 567.  
 [Simson of Chinon ס' הכריתות].
283. MATATIA חזן B. MOSES, cf. cod. Paris 400.  
 a 1492 at Venice: cod. Paris 968.  
 [Elia del Medigo b. Moses, Commentary on Averroes' "De substantia orbis"].
284. MATATIA B. NETHANAEI, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 113 nr. 972.  
 a [15th cent.]?: cod. de Rossi 11 some parts after the Pentateuch.  
 [instead of Levi b. Ahron Halfan; see 278e].
285. MEIR B. ISAAC<sup>34</sup>  
 a 1451: cod. Paris 1223 for Samuel b. Uziel.  
 [Abraham ibn Ezra, ס' צחות].  
 b Tebet 27, 1474 at קרימא Crema: cod. Turin 192 (Cat. p. 203) for Naphtali b. Meshullam.  
 [Moses Narboni, Commentary on Averroes and Levi b. Gershon, Commentary on Megillot].

<sup>32</sup> Judah b. Samuel סִיני of Cologne, owner of cod. Turin 71 (Cat. p. 66). The buyer, Leon Sini (on Tebet 27, 1481) lived later, cf. HB XX, 130, cf. cod. Turin 35 (Cat. p. 41). Cf. Centralanzeiger p. 106. Gallia Jud. 71.

<sup>33</sup> A Matatia, who wrote cod. Neofiti 27 is perhaps identical with the scribe of cod. de Rossi 14; others, cf. ZfHB XI, 93.

<sup>34</sup> Meir in Italy wrote 1458 cod. Ghirondi 112A. דרשות on Genesis and Exodus composed 1415.

286. MEIR B. ISAAC LATHIF of Jerusalem, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 110 nr. 798.
- a Elul 1, 1481 at לנייאנו Legnago (Venezia): cod. Bisliches (Geiger, Wiss. Zeitschr. III, 284 nr. 14) = cod. Jellinek = cod. Israel. Kultusgemeinde, Wien 35 (Cat. p. 21), cf. CB 2674.  
[Tobia b. Eliezer, לקח טוב].
287. MEIR B. MOSES IBN LATHIF, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 110 nr. 799; Blondheim, Liste p. 28 nr. 167.
- a Shebat 1399 at Camerino: cod. Oxford 187 for Benjamin b. Isaac.  
[Rashi on Pentateuch].
  - b Ab 11 (? cf. Zunz ZG 217) 1419 at Fermo: cod. de Rossi 1161 for Menahem b. Jehiel.  
[Maimonides' Commentary on חלק].
288. MEIR B. SAMUEL of Arles in the Provence דשלויש Deslois. Gallia Jud. 652 of Sauves. Meir des Salves: Ecrivains 609, cf. Rivista Israel. VI (1909) p. 29.
- a Elul 17, 1396: cod. Oxford 189 for Daniel b. Samuel ha-Rophe cf. ZfHB XVIII, 44 nr. 1909.  
[Rashi on Pentateuch], cf. Blondheim, Liste p. 28 nr. 169. Rivista Israel. V, 233.
  - b Adar 7, 1397 at פישאה Pescia (Toscana): cod. Sassoon 1028 (Cat. p. 902) for his teacher Jehiel b. Matatia מן הכנסת de Synagoga.  
[Maḥzor Rite of Toscana (Rite of Rome)].
  - c the same colophon is in cod. Jew. Theol. Seminary סדר תפלות טושקאנה formerly cod. O. H. Schorr, cf. החלון IX, 2, p. 50, cf. Gross in MGWJ 29 S. 174; Cassuto, Famiglia da Pisa in "Rivista Israelitica" V, 1908, p. 229.
  - d Adar I 1, 1434: cod. Turin 118.  
[Levi b. Gershon, Commentary on Job], cf. CB 1613; Ecrivains p. 609.
289. MEIR JEDIDIAH B. JONATHAN HA-KOHEN
- a Iyyar 17, 1309 at אספיליון Spello: cod. Nationalbibliothek in Wien 71 (Cat. p. 66) for Moses b. Shabbethai.  
[Hiyya b. Solomon השולחן 'ס].



290. MEIR SOFER, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 110 nr. 804.  
 a Kislev 3, 1446: cod. de Rossi 471 for Menaḥem b. Jekutiel Finzi.  
 [David Kimḥi, Commentary on Prophetæ Priores].
291. MENAḤEM in Ferrara, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 110 nr. 819.  
 a Adar II 6, 1397 at Ferrara: cod. de Rossi 758.  
 [Psalms, Job and Proverbs].
292. MENAḤEM DA PISA.  
 a [14th cent.] Corrector of cod. Turin 57.  
 [Maḥzor German rite].
293. MENAḤEM B. BENJAMIN, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 111 nr. 831; Kobak *ישרון* VI (1868), p. 169, Zunz, Litg. 369; Steinschneider, Vorlesungen p. 46.  
 a Nisan 3–9, 1287: cod. L. Schwager & D. Fränkel, Cat. XI (Husiatyn 1906) nr. 34.  
 [Isaac b. Malkizedek of Siponto, Commentary on Seder Zeraim].  
 b Adar I. 15, 1316: cod. Parma 1390 = cod. Perreau 13 for his teacher Ephraim.  
 [Nehoniah b. ha-Kana, *ס' הייחוד*].  
 c 1316–17: cod. Paris 1221.  
 [Juda ibn Bal'am treatises], cf. S. Fuchs in *החוקר* I, 200. H. Ueb. 914. Arab. Lit. p. 139.
294. MENAḤEM ל ח י B. ELIA DE ROSSI<sup>35</sup> cf. ZfHB XVIII, 110 nr. 827 and 828; Zunz, Ges. Schriften III, 209, Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 396; *כ"ח* V, 132.  
 a Marḥesvan 1, (October 12), 1474 at Ferrara: cod. Ambrosiana 91.  
 [Judah Messer Leon, *נופת צופים*].  
 b Kislev 7, 1475 at Ferrara: cod. de Rossi 1204.  
 [Canticles with Commentary of Abraham b. Isaac Levi], cf. HB IX, 111, nr. 5.  
 c Tammuz 12, 1480: cod. Halberstam 1 = Hirschfeld 269.  
 [Nethanael Kaspi *ל' ישראל*], cf. HB XVI, 127.

<sup>35</sup> His son is: Zakariah b. Menaḥem b. Elia de Rossi of Cesena. He wrote May 4, 1501 at Roncofreddo (Prov. Forlì) cod. Parma 1418 = Perreau 41 [Nissim b. Moses b. Solomon b. Moses *נסים*], cf. HB XII, 107 nr. 42.

- d Iyyar 3 (April 26), 1487 at Ravenna: cod. de Rossi 272.  
[Ecclesiastes with Samuel ibn Tibbon's Commentary].
- e Tammuz 12, 1490 at Forlì: cod. Oxford 1229 for Abraham de Finzi of Bologna.  
[ר' הכורין translated by Judah ibn Tibbon], cf. HB XII, 107.
295. MENAHEM ב. א. מ. ב. ISAAC י. א. ע. י. א. ע. י. א. ע. י. א. ע.  
a Tammuz 13, 1441 at Lecce: cod. Oxford 2822 N. 25.  
[The end of Book II of Avicenna's Canon].
296. MENAHEM B. ISAAC.  
a Adar 3, 1474 at Cremona: cod. Kennicott 586.  
[Pentateuch with Targum and Rashi, Megillot, Job].
297. MENAHEM B. JACOB סקארלינו SCARLINO, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 111 nr. 839.  
a Tebet 25, 1381: cod. de Rossi 172.  
[Isaac of Corbeil סמ"ק with many הגהות cf. ZfHB XIX, 52].
298. MENAHEM B. JEHIEL ROPHE of the family Gallico in Fermo,<sup>36</sup>  
cf. Menaḥem b. Moses Rophe, cf. ZfHB XVII, 159 nr. 1401.  
a Tebet 6, 1394: cod. Paris 208 for Joseph b. Mordecai Zarfati.  
[David Kimḥi on Psalms].  
b Marḥesvan 7, 1415: cod. Vittorio Emanuele 10 (Cat. p. 47).  
[parts of More Nebukim and Kusari].
299. MENAHEM B. JEKUTIEL HA-KOHEN RAPA, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 111 nr. 842.  
a 1477 at Padua: cod. Hamburg 353.  
[Isaac of Düren שער דורא].<sup>37</sup>
300. MENAHEM B. JOSEPH ISAAC in Aquila, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 111 nr. 835.  
a Tammuz 24, 1412 at Aquila: cod. Kennicott 120=cod. Br. Mus. 238 II.  
[Immanuel b. Solomon, Commentary on Canticles].  
b Nisan 1415 at Aquila: cod. Kennicott 120=cod. Br. Mus. 238.I.  
[Levi b. Gershon, Commentary on Job].
301. MENAHEM B. JOSEPH RAPA, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 111 nr. 837;  
Centralanzeiger p. 97.

<sup>36</sup> For him Moses b. Abraham wrote Nisan 25, 1432 cod. de Rossi 739.

<sup>37</sup> Cod. Hamburg 353: ברכות מהר"ם dated: Adar I. 23, 1492.

- a Kislev 1320: cod. de Rossi 860.  
[Maḥzor, provençal Rite, cf. Zunz, *Ges. Schriften* III, 9].
- 302. MENAḤEM פריגורי PERIGORI, cf. *Gallia Jud.* 302] b. Joseph Vivente ויונטי, cf. *ZfHB* XVIII, 111 nr. 836.
- a Nisan 1446: cod. Oxford 1605.  
[Cabbalistical treatises].
- b Iyyar 3, 1467 at Corfu: cod. Paris 308 for Samuel ibn Shoham (Beryllo) b. David, cf. *ZfHB* XVIII, 46 nr. 1935.  
[Aḥai Gaon שאלחות].
- 303. MENAḤEM B. MENAḤEM ROPHE di Climontoni in Padua.
- a Sivan 17, 1420: cod. Vittorio Emanuele 26 (*Cat.* p. 52),  
cf. *ibid.* cod. 6 and 7 (*Cat.* p. 45).  
[Levi b. Gershom מלחמות ה'].
- 304. MENAḤEM B. MORDECAI HA-ROPHE b. Moses ha-Rophe b. MENAḤEM HA-ROPHE.
- a [s. a.] Adar at Rome: cod. Neofiti 1. for Egidio di Viterbo.  
[Targum Onkelos on Pentateuch].
- 305. MENAḤEM B. MORDECAI, cf. *Berliner Ges. Schriften* I, p. 125.
- a Kislev 8, 1440: cod. Parma 3516=cod. Perreau 66 (*Cat.* p. 176).  
[Jacob b. Asher שור אבן העזר].
- 306. MENAḤEM B. MOSES in Bologna, cf. *ZfHB* XVIII, 111 nr. 844.
- a 1395 at Bologna: cod. de Rossi 351.  
[Treatises on the Calendar] cf. *H Ueb.* 615.
- 307. MENAḤEM B. MOSES ROPHE b. Solomon b. Samuel Gallico b. Jeḥiel, see: Menaḥem b. Jeḥiel Rophe, cf. *ZfHB* XVIII, 111 nr. 845.
- a Adar 11, 1421: cod. de Rossi 631.  
[Levi b. Gershom, Commentary on Job].
- 308. MENAḤEM B. SAMUEL, cf. *ZfHB* XVIII, 111 nr. 849.
- a Elul 1418: cod. München 97.  
[Midrash Bereshit and Bamidbar Rabba].
- 309. MENAḤEM B. SIMSON ZARFATI, cf. *ZfHB* XVIII, 111 nr. 850.
- a Nisan 27, 1477 at Rovigo: cod. Almanzi 152 (HB V, 47)=  
cod. Br. Mus. 203 for Judah Finzi.  
[Later Prophets with David Kimḥi's Commentary].



310. MENAHEM OF TERRACINA [Menaḥem b. Meshullam]<sup>38</sup> [15th cent.] probably the scribe of cod. de Rossi 1296 [Mishne Torah Part III]. De Rossi followed by Zunz (Kerem Chemed V, 155), lists: Samuel b. Jehiel of Pisa as scribe. However his name appears only on the last leaf, see: Samuel b. Jehiel of Pisa, cf. D. Kaufmann in REJ XXVI, 88 = Ges. Schriften II, 264, III, 207; Cassuto, Firenze 126.
311. MENAHEM ZEMAḤ B. ABRAHAM [JACOB] ROPHE b. Benjamin b. Jehiel Anaw, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 111 nr. 848; Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 331, Berliner, Ges. Schriften I, 63; Blondheim Liste p. 38 nr. 260; ZfHB XVII, 159 nr. 1405; Zunz, Ges. Schriften III, 179–80.
- a probably: Marḥesvan 5, 1307: cod. Br. Mus. 908.  
[Maimonides, מורה נבוכים].
- b Tammuz, 1319: cod. Milan (Ambrosiana), 87.  
[Compendium of Baḥya b. Joseph חובות הלבבות], cf. Berliner, Ges. Schriften I, 116 nr. 3.
- c 1322: cod. Kennicott 394 = Zürich, Stadtbibliothek.  
[Megillot].
- d [1322–26]: cod. Paris 1125 cf. Magazin I, 49 for Shabbethai b. Abraham b. Moses Uri.  
[Isaac b. Solomon Israeli ספר בדיעת השתן].
- e Sivan 18, 1323 at Rome: cod. de Rossi 692–694.  
[Commentaries on the Bible. Proverbs with Moses Kimḥi's Commentary], cod. de Rossi 694 written in four months and six days.
- f Marḥesvan 1323 at Rome: cod. Angelica I, 27 (Cat. p. 88).  
[David Kimḥi, מכלול].
- g Kislev 14, 1326 at Frascati: cod. Kennicott 240 = cod. Angelica I, 7 (Cat. p. 86).  
[מלכים with Isaiah de Trani's commentary], cf. Magazin I, 45. HB XVIII, 110. Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 390.
- h [s. a.] cr. 1322–1323: cod. de Rossi 691.  
[Benjamin b. Judah of Rome, Commentary on Chronicles], cf. de Rossi, Cat. II p. 134 . . . "in Paralipomena R. Benjamin di Roma."

<sup>38</sup> Owner of cod. Oxford 1491, cod. de Rossi 878 and cod. Casanata 48 (Cat. p. 511).

312. MENAḤEM מַקְסְטִילִין OF CASTIGLION Fiorentino, cf. Brüll, Jahrbücher IX, 81.  
 a [s. a.]: cod. Schönblum 1868 nr. 3 = cod. Ghironi 31.  
 [Naḥmanides, Commentary on Job], cf. Steinschneider, Catalog . . . M. S. Ghironi 1872 p. 12 nr. 31 Menachem de Castillas (מַקְסְטִילֵאשׁ).
313. MESHULLAM FORTE OF VELLETRI (מְבִילִטְרִי) b. Jehiel of Terni.  
 a Iyyar 1, 1418: cod. Nationalbibliothek Wien 97A (Cat. p. 99).  
 [Maḥzor rite of Rome].  
 b Tammuz 29, 1418: cod. Turin 256 (Cat. p. 274).  
 [Petrus Hispanus, Logica cf. H Ueb. 471], cf. Cassuto, Firenze 266 [wrongly: Volterra 1420 in HB XXI, 76, cf. H Ueb. 471, Magazin I, 65].  
 c 1421: cod. Paris 612 for Nathan b. Samuel.  
 [part II of Maḥzor rite of Rome]  
 d Tishri 24, 1424: cod. Rabbi of Gora Kalwarja = cod. Jew. Theol. Sem.  
 [Maḥzor rite of Rome in two Volumes], cf. Register of the Jew. Theol. Sem. 5683 p. 31.<sup>39</sup>
314. MESHULLAM NAḤMIAS<sup>40</sup> B. NATHAN מִן הַכִּנּוּס da Synagoga b. Meshullam b. Abraham Rophe, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 113 nr. 965; Zunz, Ges. Schriften III, 171; Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 333.  
 a Adar 13, 1428 at Perugia: cod. de Rossi 475.  
 [Pentateuch].  
 b Marḥesvan 16, 1429: cod. Oxford 237 for Meshullam b. Isaac of סִינִי.  
 [Levi b. Gershom אֵלֶּיךָ נִפְשׁ].
315. MESHULLAM B. SOLOMON.  
 a Adar 2, 1427: cod. Paris 816 for Jonatan Jesi (Ghisi) b. Joab in San Severino on the Potenza.  
 [Joseph Gikatilia ס' הָאוֹרָה].

<sup>39</sup> The recipe for ink in cod. Parma 1420 = cod. Perreau 43 n. 5 (Cat. p. 147) is perhaps from the same Meshullam Sofer cf. HB XII, 110.

<sup>40</sup> Bernheimer, Paleografia ebr. p. 266 reads: Neḥemiah instead of Naḥmias.

316. MESHULLAM OF SEZZE (סיצי; about Sezze cf. Cassuto Firenze 259).  
 a Tebet 19—Shebat 30 [14th cent.]: cod. de Rossi 13.  
 [Pentateuch and Prophetæ Priores].
317. MESHULLAM DA VOLTERRA, see: Meshullam Forte of Velletri.
318. MISHAEL IN ROME, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 110 nr. 812; Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 278.  
 a 1299: cod. Bisliches 68, cf. הפליט, p. 24.  
 [סדר סדר תפלות rite of Rome].
319. MISHAEL B. ABRAHAM HA-ROPHE of Verona, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 110 nr. 813. Dukes in Litbl. d. Orients IX, 309. HB XI, 105 n. 2; ZfHB XVII, 161 nr. 1426 [read Mishael instead Michael]; CB 1390.  
 a [before 1308] [at Rome]?: cod. Paris 364 for Isaac b. Judah [Isaiah di Trani פסקים on נשים].
320. MORDECAI.  
 a 1373: cod. Br. Mus. 517 for Samuel ha-Rophe of Gubbio (אנוביאו).  
 [fourteen quires of the החינוך].
321. MORDECAI B. ABIGDOR.  
 a Tammuz 6, 1458 at סירמיני. Sermione: cod. Halberstam 194 = Hirschfeld 271.  
 [Abba Mari מנחת קנאות].
322. MORDECAI B. ABRAHAM FARRISOL, cf. D. Kaufmann, Ges. Schriften III, 205. 218. 219; HB VII, 17, XXI, 27; Mortara, Indice, p. 39, n. 1.  
 a Adar 9, 1472 at Ferrara: cod. Turin 5 for Abraham, Moses and Raphael of Urbino, sons of Menaḥem of Mantua.  
 [Jacob b. Asher, טורים].  
 b Nisan 1485: cod. R. N. Rabinowitz Cat. II p. 32 = Cat. III p. 46 nr. 32 = cod. Halberstam 393 = cod. Hirschfeld 228.  
 [Haggadah, rite of Spain].
323. MORDECAI DURANT FARISSOL [probably a Frenchman], cf. ZfHB XVIII, 111 nr. 864; Gallia Jud. 539.  
 a Ab 25, 1465: cod. Oxford 2426 N. 3 for Jacob Leon of Cavaillon.  
 [Levi b. Gershon מלחמות ה'].



324. MORDECAI ב. הלבֿלֿר B. ABRAHAM MOSES of Corbeil, see: Mordecai b. Abraham Moses כּוֹכֵב.  
 a Iyyar 13, 1448: cod. Jew. Theol. Semin. for Judah b. Moses Finzi.  
 [Levi b. Gershon, Commentary on Pent.], cf. Register of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America 5683 p. 31.
325. MORDECAI B. ABRAHAM MOSES כּוֹכֵב (STELLA), cf. ZfHB XVII, 163 nr. 1467; HB XXI, 28 [missing in Gallia Jud. 52–53]. CB 1533.  
 a [15th cent.]?: cod. Asher 21 = cod. Strassburg 20.  
 [Collectanea of medical treatises].  
 b [s. a.]: cod. Paris 974.  
 [רוח חַיִּים and others].
326. MORDECAI B. BENJAMIN  
 a [15th cent.]: cod. Oxford 1945 for Benjamin b. Isaac.  
 [ס' הַיְחֻד Chapters on the ten Sephirot].
327. MORDECAI B. BENJAMIN אֶשְׁפִּילֹ of SPELLO, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 111 nr. 856; ZfHB XVII, 162 nr. 1454.  
 a Shebat 2, 1374: cod. Oxford 1319 for his master and uncle Moses b. Mordecai.  
 [מִלּוֹת הַרְגִּיזִין Maimonides].
328. MORDEḤAI ELḤANAN, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 111 nr. 855.  
 a 1440 at Rimini: cod. de Rossi 747.  
 [Proverbs with Immanuel b. Solomon's Commentary].
329. MORDECAI B. ELIA ELI of the Provence, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 111 nr. 857; Gallia Jud. 492.  
 a Tammuz 20, 1456: cod. Oxford 1087.<sup>41</sup>  
 [Maḥzor rite of Catalonia].  
 b 1456: cod. Oxford 1139, cf. ZfHB XIV, 110 nr. 94.  
 [Common prayers].  
 c Tebet 4, 1463: cod. Nikolsburg 3 = Boston, Medical Library, cod. 10.  
 [Avicenna, Canon Book III], cf. A. Z. Schwarz, Nikolsburger Hebr. Handschriften in: A. S. Freidus' Memorial Volume New York 1929 p. 177, H. Gilhofer & H. Ransch-

<sup>41</sup> Sold at Bitonto Marḥesvan 10, 1468; cf. שֵׁפֶת יֵהֵר ed. 1843 fol. 35b.

burg Auction XIII Luzern 1934 p. 95 nr. 473; James F. Ballard, Catalogue of the medieval and renaissance Manuscripts . . . in the Boston Medical Library Boston, 1944, nr. 10.

330. MORDECAI B. ḤAYYIM אַמנדנטי [i. e. Emendante, a corrector, cf. Add. and Corrig. on Margoliouth Cat. Part IV p. 184] Nakdan and מסרן Massorete.
- a [14th cent.]: cod. R. N. Rabinowitz, Cat. 3 (1883), nr. 2 = cod. Ginsburg 49 = cod. Br. Mus. 179.  
[Pentateuch, Megilloth and Haphtaroth (illuminated), cf. Ginsburg, Introduction, p. 719].
331. MORDECAI B. ISAAC DI TIVOLI.
- a [15th cent.]: cod. Paris 269.  
[Moses Ḥalayo, Commentary on Canticles].
332. MORDECAI B. ISAAH, cf. Magazin I, 17; H. Ueb. 9.
- a Marḥesvan 1423 at Aquila: cod. Casanata 155.  
[Gershon b. Solomon שער השמים].
333. MORDECAI B. LEVI ḤALFAN, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 111; Zunz, Ges. Schriften III, 11; Sonne in HUCA XVI, 53;
- a Iyyar 22, 1477 at Ferrara: cod. Oxford 376 for Noah b. Immanuel Norzi.  
[Commentary on Aboth, attributed to Rashi (described by Luzzatto כ"ח IV, 201)].
- b Nissan 10, 1480 at Ancona: cod. de Rossi 657 for Jehiel.  
[Rashi on Pentateuch], cf. Blondheim, Liste p. 37 nr. 257, see: Levi b. Ahron Halfan.
334. MORDECAI DA SOGLIANO (מיסוליאנו), cf. Cat. Br. Mus. IV, Add. & Corrig. p. 189) b. Moses Tobi, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 111 nr. 868; HB I, 88 n. 3.
- a Elul 19, 1492 at Carpi: cod. Almanzi 258 = cod. Br. Mus. 546 for the brothers Raphael, Samuel, Isaac b. Daniel.  
[Jacob b. Asher טורים].
- b Iyyar 23, [1449] 1499 at Rimini: cod. de Rossi 41 for Menahem b. Isaac of Revere, cf. cod. de Rossi 6.  
[Megilloth with Rashi's and Gersonides' Commentary], cf. Zunz ZG. 217. 219; Blondheim, Liste p. 35 nr. 229.

335. MORDECAI B. OBADIA, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 111 nr. 872.  
 a Iyyar 30, 1446: cod. Halberstam 438 = cod. Jew. Theol. Semin. for his teacher Jehiel b. Jekutiel Beth-El. [Maḥzor rite of Rome].  
 b Iyyar 12, 1450: cod. Br. Mus. 1058 for Abraham b. Joseph Kohen.  
 [Jedaiah Bedarshi כתב החנצלות].
- 335A MORDECAI B. SOLOMON da Camerino, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 111 nr. 876.  
 a Nisan 25, 1449: cod. Nationalbibliothek in Wien 163 (Cat. p. 175) for Solomon b. Jehiel.  
 [Kalonymos משרח משה].
336. MORDECAI DA PISA B. SOLOMON da Camerino di Beth-El., cf. Berliner, Geschichte d. Juden in Rom II, 1 p. 116, Cassuto, Firenze 260 nr. 13; Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 333.  
 a July 11, 1483: cod. Bibl. Nazionale Firenze Pal. 529.<sup>42</sup>  
 [Nathan b. Jehiel, עירך].
337. MORDECAI B. SAMUEL b. Abraham, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 111 nr. 877.  
 a [in the beginning of the 15th cent.]: cod. Saraval 13 = Zuckermann 64 for the physician Menaḥem b. Meshullam cf. ZfHB XVII, 160 nr. 1410.  
 [David Kimḥi, Commentary on Isaiah].
338. MORDECAI BENJAMIN B. MENAḤEM ROPHE in Fermo, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 111 nr. 859; ZfHB XVII, 163 nr. 1462, Zunz, Ges. Schriften III, 172.  
 a December 19, 1412 at Casale Monferrato (Ripa Transone): cod. de Rossi 750.  
 [Maimonides, מלות ההגיון].
339. MORDECAI FINZI in Mantua (1441–1473), cf. ZfHB XVIII, 111 nr. 871; Steinschneider in Bibliotheca Mathematica III. Folge II p. 59.  
 a Kislev 24 (= Dec. 13), 1446: cod. Wright 124.  
 [Commentary of Averroes on Aristoteles, transl. by Moses ibn Tibbon], cf. Herbert Loewe, Cat. p. 117/18; Library of John Lee, see: Howell and Stewarts, Cat. nr. 2864.

<sup>42</sup> Berliner and Vogelstein u. Rieger erroneously: cod. Laurentiana 529.



- b Adar 1, 1460 at Viadana: cod. Berlin 119 (only fol. 121–148).  
[ibn Tofeil **אָנרֶה חַי בֶּן יִקְטָן**], cf. Steinschneider Cat. Berlin p. 102.
340. MOSES  
a Sivan 27, 1390: cod. Br. Mus. 508.  
[Moses of Coucy **סִמְעוֹן**].
341. MOSES, cf. Blondheim, Liste p. 17 nr. 69.  
a [14th cent.]?: cod. Br. Mus. 175.  
[Rashi's Commentary on the Pentateuch, Rashi on Canticles and Ecclesiastes].
342. MOSES  
a [15th cent.]: cod. Kennicott 226 = Vat. 6.  
[Hagiographa and Prophets].
343. MOSES IN TREVISO, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 111 nr. 879; ZfHB XIX, 61.  
a Adar 16, 1453 at Treviso: cod. de Rossi 653.  
[**סְדוּר** German rite].
345. MOSES B. ABIGDOR, cf. Angelo di Capua Cat. p. 45 nr. 7  
a [15th cent.]: cod. Vittorio Emanuele 7 for Menaḥem b. Menaḥem Rophe.<sup>43</sup>  
[Samuel ibn Tibbon, Commentary on Kohelet].
346. MOSES B. ABRAHAM.  
a Adar 6, 1491: cod. Nationalbibliothek in Wien 136 (Cat. p. 146).  
[Maimonides **מֹרֶה נְבוֹכִים**].
347. MOSES B. ABRAHAM of Treviso, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 112 nr. 887; Blondheim, Liste p. 38 nr. 263.  
a Nisan 25, 1432: cod. de Rossi 739 for Menaḥem b. Jehiel Gallico in Fermo.  
[Rashi on Pentateuch].
348. MOSES B. ABRAHAM ZAHALON.  
a 1495: cod. Firkowitsch 343–345 N. 2.  
[Mordecai Comtino, a mathematical treatise], cf. Jonas Gurland, *Kurze Beschreibung . . .* Petersburg 1866, p. 6.
349. MOSES ḤAYYIM B. ABRAHAM, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 112 nr. 899; Blondheim, Liste p. 36 nr. 242.
- <sup>43</sup> See: Menaḥem b. Menaḥem Rophe ha-Sofer nr. 303; he was owner of cod. Vittorio Emanuele 6 and 26.

- a Tammuz 25, 1265: cod. de Rossi 390.  
[Rashi on Pentateuch, Megillot and Haphtarot].
- 350. MOSES HA-SOFER B. BENJAMIN of Rome, liturgical poet of the 12th cent., cf. Zunz, Litg. 455–457, 651. Zunz, Ges. Schriften III, 161 n. 7 and p. 184; CB 2768; ZfHB XVIII, 112 nr. 894.
- 351. MOSES HA-ROPHE B. BENJAMIN of Rome [probably a nephew of Zidkia b. Abraham Anaw, author of שבלי הלקט], cf. Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 387 n. 2, cf. ZfHB XVII, 166 nr. 1522.
- a Adar I, 4, 1292: cod. Paris 182 for Joab b. Benjamin.  
[Abraham ibn Ezra's short commentary on Exodus].
- 352. MOSES BETH-EL of the Provence in Avignon.
- a Kislev 1—Nisan 1, 1438 at Avignon: cod. Oxford 711.  
[Jacob b. Asher טור אבן העזר].
- 353. MOSES B. DANIEL of Fermo is called ha-Sofer in cod. de Rossi 305, cf. A. Berliner, Aus Handschriften in D. Hoffmann Festschrift, p. 289.
- 354. MOSES B. DANIEL B. MOSES da Norzi, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 112 nr. 897.
- a Adar 4, 1391: cod. Saraval 60 = Zuckermann 67 for the physician Abraham b. Jehiel of Bologna.  
[Maḥzor rite of Rome].
- 355. MOSES B. ELIA.
- a [before 1290]: cod. Paris 370 for Samuel b. Meir.  
[Moses of Coucy סמ"י, Part I].
- 356. MOSES B. ELIA.
- a Tammuz 23, 1347: cod. de Rossi 742.  
[Proverbs, Job and Daniel].
- 357. MOSES B. ELIA מלמד, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 112 nr. 889; Blondheim, Liste p. 42 nr. 304.
- a Adar 1, 1413: cod. Vat. 47.  
[Rashi on Pentateuch].
- b Adar 6, 1416: cod. Halberstam 90 = Hirschfeld 415.  
[Nathan b. Jehiel ערוך].
- c Elul 3, 1419: cod. de Rossi 483.  
[Maḥzor rite of Rome].
- 358. MOSES B. ḤAYYIM of Rome, cf. Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 278. 331. ZfHB XVIII, 112 nr. 901.

- a Iyyar 1304: cod. Kennicott 574=cod. de Rossi 3 for his teacher Joab b. Benjamin in Rome.  
[Bible].
359. MOSES B. HAYYIM HA-SEFARDI, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 112 nr. 903; Berliner in D. Hoffmann Festschrift S. 291.
- a Iyyar 22, 1499: cod. de Rossi 940 for Samuel b. Maimon.  
[Bible].
360. MOSES B. ISAAC of Cesena,<sup>44</sup> cf. ZfHB XVIII, 112 nr. 929.
- a [15th cent.]: cod. de Rossi 1169.  
[Avicenna's medical work ארונה, cf. Bj. א 954].
361. MOSES B. ISAAC of Rieti [48 years old], cf. ZfHB XVIII, 112 nr. 931.
- a 1436 at Perugia: cod. de Rossi 1376.  
[Averroes עצם השמים].
362. MOSES ROPHE B. ISAAC b. קאבש Gabes? מירקי Majorki, cf. JQR XI, 602 [perhaps a Candiote], cf. ZfHB XVIII, 113 nr. 956; ZfHB XVII, 167 nr. 1540.
- a [cr. 1500]: cod. Oxford 867 for Solomon b. Elia Capsali הוקן [Moses of Coucy סמ"ג part II].
363. MOSES B. JACOB, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 112 nr. 915.
- a 1383: cod. Vat. 283 N. 6 for Jacob b. Samuel.  
[Isaac Lathif b. Abraham, Commentary on Kohelet].
364. MOSES B. JACOB, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 112 nr. 917; Steinschneider in the Introduction to תנמודי הנפש, p. 8.
- a Tebet 26, 1446: cod. Turin 216.  
[Bruno di Lungoburgo הכריתות ס' transl. by Hillel of Verona].
365. MOSES B. JACOB BARZILAI.
- a Tammuz 1345 at Rimini: cod. Columbia (New York) x 893-G 363 (Fränkel 475).  
[a collection of cabalistic treatises], cf. Isaac Mendelson, Near East Collections at Columbia New York 1940, p. 294.
366. MOSES B. JEHIEL.
- a [before 1303]: cod. Paris 38.  
[Pentateuch with Targum, Megillot and Haphtarot].

<sup>44</sup> At Cesena is written: Marḥesvan 1468 cod. R. N. Rabinowitz Cat. III p. 45 nr. 25 סדרו rite of Rome.



367. MOSES B. JEKUTIEL חפץ of the family Zifroni, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 112 nr. 932; Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 421, HB IV, 123.  
 a Shebat 1, 1383 at Forli: cod. Almanzi 79 = Br. Mus. 616 for Daniel מר"ה (cf. Zunz, Ges. Schriften III, 212) b. Samuel Rophe b. Daniel דיין cf. ZfHB XVIII, 44 nr. 1908.  
 [rite of Rome].
368. MOSES B. JOSEPH of Montalboddo (Prov. Ancona), cf. ZfHB XVIII, 112 nr. 910.  
 a Sivan 11, 1369 at אלבודו Montalboddo: cod. Oxford 601 for his son Matatia.  
 [Mishne Torah VIII to XIV].
369. MOSES B. JOSEPH b. Jehosif in Rome, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 112 nr. 909; Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 278 n. 14. 395; Zunz, Litg. 346.  
 a Nisan 1302: cod. de Rossi 1067.  
 [Maimonides, מורה נבוכים].
370. MOSES ב. מנחם (MENKES) B. JOSUA [perhaps a German], cf. ZfHB XVIII, 112 nr. 906; ZfHB XIX, 56.  
 a 1492: cod. de Rossi 148 for Menaḥem b. Simson.  
 [glosses on the Minhagim], cf. Ecrivains 681 N. 3.
371. MOSES B. JUDAH b. Benjamin.  
 a Marḥesvan 4, 1316 at Osimo: cod. Almanzi 8 = cod. Br. Mus. 1063.  
 [Abraham bar Hiyya העיבור].
372. MOSES B. JUDAH [מן הנערים] di Adolescenti in Rome ca. 1300, wrote מדרש החכמה by Judah b. Solomon Kohen, cf. HB VI, 51. 52; XI, 44; XIV, 6. CB p. 1834 and CXV.
373. MOSES B. JUDAH B. ISAAC BIANCHI (ממשפחת הלבנים).  
 a [15th cent.]: cod. Oxford 2408.  
 [Collectanea of controversial treatises].
374. MOSE LEVI, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 133 nr. 937.  
 a Tishri 1467: cod. de Rossi 102.  
 [Joseph Kaspi המוסר].  
 b [15th cent.]<sup>45</sup>: cod. Oxford 2450 for maestro Abraham de Balmes, cf. Krafft u. Deutsch, Kat. Wien S. 152.  
 [Levi b. Gershon, commentary on Averroes paraphrase of "de anima" ס' הנפש].

<sup>45</sup> About the date, cf. Cat. Oxford 2450 Add. & Corr. p. 1163.

375. MOSES B. MATATIA, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 113 nr. 946.  
 a [before 1385] at Imola: cod. Paris 611 for Menahem b. Abraham.  
 [Maḥzor rite of Rome].  
 b May 1404: cod. Kennicott 137 = cod. Oxford 2332 for his half-brother Moses b. Daniel of Macerata.  
 [Psalms, Job, Proverbs].
376. MOSES B. MOSES [Bathosa]?, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 113 nr. 943.  
 a Shebat 17, 1476: cod. de Rossi 569.  
 [Prophiat Duran, Commentary on More Nebuchim].
377. MOSES B. NISSIM KIMḥI in Corneto Tarquinia (Prov. Rome), cf. ZfHB XVIII, 113 nr. 947; Zunz, ZG. 516 note g. Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 349.  
 a Iyyar 2, 1413 at Corneto: cod. de Rossi 598.  
 [Pentateuch, Prophets and Megillot].  
 b Ab, 1413 at Corneto (בנלילות רומא): cod. Oxford 2087.  
 [Serapion (the elder) 'Practica'].  
 c [s. a.]: cod. Gunzbourg 770.  
 [Zidkia Anaw שבלי הלקט].
378. MOSES ROMANUS.  
 a Shebat 12, 1432: Kennicott 511 = cod. Zelada = cod. Toledo 5.  
 [Pentateuch, Megillot and Haphtarot], cf. J. Millas Vallicrosa, Manuscriptos Hebraicos en Toledo in: Al-Andalus. Vol. II, 1934, p. 405.
379. MOSES B. SHABBETHAI of Palestine, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 113 nr. 958.  
 a Adar I. 25, 1413 at טיאנו Teano: cod. Laur. Pl. 88,2 (Cat. p. 428) for himself.  
 [David Kimḥi מכלול].
380. MOSES B. SHABBETHAI HA-LEVI, cf. Magazin I, 17 = Berliner, Ges. Schriften I, 47.  
 a Shebat 5, 1482: cod. Br. Mus. 1117.  
 [Judah Messer Leon מכלל יופי].  
 b Adar 5, 1483: cod. Casanata 154.  
 [Judah Messer Leon, Commentary on intermediate Commentary of Averroes on Isagoge, Categories and Rhetoric], cf. H Ueb. 154.

381. MOSES B. SHABBETHAI of פוני [l. נייפוני Giffone], cf. REJ IX, 153.  
 a [15th cent.]?: cod. Nationalbibliothek in Wien 43 (Cat. p. 48) for Judah b. Benjamin Kohen.  
 [Excerpts of Isaac b. Juda's רוא פענה].
382. MOSES B. SOLOMON.  
 a Febr. 9, 1431: cod. Vittorio Emanuele 3 (Cat. p. 42).  
 [Psalms, Daniel, Ezra and Neḥemiah].
383. MOSES B. SOLOMON HA-LEVI, cf. Berliner, Ges. Schriften I, 122.  
 a Shebat 1355: cod. Naples III F. 6.  
 [David Kimḥi שרשים].
384. MOSES B. SAMUEL  
 a [13th cent.]: cod. Sassoon 607 (Cat. p. 745).  
 [Zidkia Anaw שבלי הלקט].
385. MOSES B. SAMUEL KIMḤI.  
 a Sivan 1336: cod. Oxford 859.  
 [Maimonides, המצות 'ס].
386. MOSES B. SAMUEL HA-LEVI, cf. M. Lattes in Mosè Vol. 2, p. 178.  
 a Adar, 1402 at Piove di Sacco (ten miles from Padova): cod. della Libreria delle Scuole Israelitiche in Venezia 2 for Mordecai b. Isaac.  
 [Maimonides משנה חורה].
387. MOSES B. SAUL HA-LEVI.  
 a Iyyar 9, 1474 at Mantua: cod. de Rossi 973.  
 [Psalms in a סדור].
388. MOSES HA-SOFER, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 113 nr. 951.  
 a Tebet 8, 1425: cod. Vat. 292.  
 [Solomon b. Abraham Abigdor, מראה אופנים].
389. NATHAN קסאלי CASALE, cf. HB. V, 48.  
 a [15th cent.]: Almanzi 158 = Br. Mus. 148.  
 [Psalms, Job and Megillot].
390. NATHAN B. MAKHIR b. Menaḥem of Ancona in Rome b. Samuel b. Makhir of אורי Ori b. Solomon b. Anthos b. Zadoc ha-Nakdan, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 114 nr. 992; Zunz, ZG 110; Zunz, Ges. Schriften III, 179. Magazin I, 60; JQR IV, 615; cf. Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 160.



- a [cr. 11th cent.]: cod. de Rossi 12.  
[Pentateuch, with Targum and Rashi] [replaced the Babylonian punctuation of the Targum with the punctuation of Tiberias and corrected the text of the Targum, cf. *Magazin* I, 60; *JQR* IV, 615].
391. NATHAN B. Merari [Read: MORDECAI?], cf. *ZfHB* XVIII, 114 nr. 993; Kobak, *ישורון*, VII, 83; VIII, 66.
- a Kislev 23, 1455 at Ancona: cod. Laurent. Pl. 88, 52 (Cat. p. 537) for Abraham b. Joab Finzi of Recanati.  
[Judah Messer Leon, *מכלל יופי*].
392. NATHANAEL HA-NAKDAN (המנקד) B. ABRAHAM Rophe, cf. *ZfHB* XVIII, 114 nr. 1004.
- a [13th cent.]?: cod. Kennicott 194 = cod. Ambrosiana 11.  
[Chronicles].
393. NATHANAEL TRABOT B. LEVI ha-Nakdan, cf. *ZfHB* XVIII, 114 nr. 1000; Blondheim, *Liste* p. 22 nr. 111; CB 2052; *JE* XII, 215.
- a December, 1475: cod. de Rossi 7.  
[Pentateuch, Megillot, Haphtarot, Rashi etc.], cf. Blondheim, *Liste* p. 34 nr. 222; cf. cod. de Rossi 1050 (Cat. III p. 45 "calligraphus").
- b [15th cent.]: cod. Kennicott 185 = cod. Ambrosiana 5 N. 3.  
[Megillot], cf. Berliner, *Ges. Schriften* I, 111.
- c [15th cent.]: cod. Parma 3509 = cod. Perreau 10 (Cat. p. 49) [written in his old age].  
[Commentary and variants on Targum Onkelos anonymous], cf. *HB* VII, 120 nr. 12, cf. A. Berliner, *Die Massorah zum Targum Onkelos* Leipzig 1877 p. V; Landauer, *Die Massorah zum Onkelos* Amsterdam 1896 p. V.
- d [15th cent.]: cod. Paris 114 for Abraham b. Joseph Kohen in Alessandria.  
[Punctuation of the Psalms], cf. cod. Paris 148; cod. Oxford 2502.
394. NATHANAEL B. SAMUEL ZARFATI of Trani, cf. *ZfHB* XVIII, 114 nr. 1005.
- a Sivan 13, 1481: cod. Ghirondi 16 for Mordecai b. Judah of Rome.  
[Maḥzor rite of Rome].

395. NISSIM B. DAVID חטל, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 113 nr. 983.  
 a Iyyar 23, 1493 at Montalto: cod. Oxford 1488.  
 [Prophiat Duran, מעשה אפור].
396. OBADIAH JESHURUN [Abdia Jeschurun], cf. ZfHB XVIII, 114 nr. 1014; Cassuto, Firenze 261.  
 a Marḥesvan 15, 1495 at Fabriano: cod. Kennicott 464 = cod. Angelica 35 (Cat. p. 97) for his teacher the physician Judah of Camerino.  
 [Pentateuch]
397. PAOLA in Rome, BAT ABRAHAM HA-SOFER, daughter of the scribe Abraham b. Joab and wife of Solomon b. Moses b. Jekutiel 1288. 1292, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 115 nr. 1043; Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 279.  
 a Adar 4, 1288 at Rome: cod. Saraval 27 = cod. Zuckermann 104.  
 [Rashi on Prophets and parts of the Hagiographa], cf. Blondheim, Liste, p. 10 nr. 13.  
 b Tishri, 1292: cod. Oxford 635 for Menaḥem b. Benjamin. [Isaiah di Trani (the elder) הלכות].  
 c Elul 8, 1306: cod. Verona.  
 [סדר], cf. Magazin XI, 142.
398. PHAREZ B. MORDECAI ZARFATI.  
 a Adar 17, 1463: cod. Oxford 663 for Daniel מבוטרי or מבוטריי Budrio (Prov. Bologna).  
 [Solomon ibn Adret הבית הקצר].
399. PHAREZ B. MOSES FOḲ.  
 a [15th cent.]: cod. Paris 1013 for Elia b. Isaac of Mestre, cf. cod. Oxford 1748 N. 3; Cassuto, Firenze 144.  
 [Euclid's Elements]
400. PHAREZ B. NATHANAEL ELIA TRABOTTO Zarfati.<sup>46</sup>  
 a 1480: cod. Ambrosiana 95 for Jacob b. David Kalonymos הפילוסוף.  
 [Jacob b. David b. Jomtob Poel לוחות].

<sup>46</sup> His son Menahem b. Pharez b. Nathanael Elia b. Pharez (author of מקרא דרדקי) wrote a didactic poem in cod. Gunzbourg 320 cf. Neubauer in REJ IX, 153 and Ecrivains p. 715.

- b Kislev 12, 1499 at (Monte) Camerino: cod. Deinard 157 = cod. Jew. Theol. Semin. for the sons of Menaḥem, corrected by Isaac of Arles.  
[Joseph Albo העקרים].
- c [s. a.]: cod. Oxford 1137.  
[Punctuation of Common prayers] [he wrote 1541: cod. Livorno 65 N. 2.3.: Joseph Gikalia שְׁעָרֵי אֹרֶה וְשְׁעָרֵי צֶדֶק].
401. PHAREZ B. SOLOMON [perhaps a Spaniard].  
a [14th or 15 cent.]: cod. Jew. Theol. Semin. [p. 43<sup>b</sup>].  
[פירוש המרכבה, cf. HB VIII, 94], partly written by Josifya קטן מבנים.  
Cf. Register of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America 5692, p. 158.
402. PHAREZ B. SOLOMON KOHEN<sup>47</sup> of טורנוש Tournus-sur-Saone, cf. Gallia Jud. 216, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 115 nr. 1051.  
a 1470: cod. de Rossi 403.  
[Maḥzor rite of Spain, with Zidkia ha-Rophe's הנהגות].
- b 1478–1479 at Soncino: cod. Paris 422.  
[Jacob b. Asher טורים I–III].
403. PHAREZ B. SAMUEL.  
a Adar 1, 1458 at Cosenza: cod. Neofiti 4 for his uncle Solomon b. Samuel לאנס Lages.<sup>48</sup>  
[David Kimḥi, Commentary on Ezekiel and Minor Prophets].
404. PETAḤYAH in Rome [pupil of Judah b. Benjamin Anaw], cf. Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 278 n. 16  
a [13th cent.]: cod. Oxford 556 (till fol. 73)  
[Commentary on Isaac Alfasi's הלכות]
405. PINḤAS B. JUDAH ISRAEL b. Abraham Obadiah da Camerino, cf. Cassuto, Firenze 261; HB XII, 119; ישרון VII, 82; VIII, 66.  
a [before 1488]: cod. Paris 994 (for מקמריה read מקמרינו).  
[Part II of Judah Messer Leon's מכלל יופי, cf. H. Ueb. 79–80].

<sup>47</sup> Witness in cod. Turin (Cat. p. 3): Hagiographa 1477 cf. Berliner in HB XX, 128.

<sup>48</sup> Solomon הכופר b. Samuel cf. H. Ueb. 44.



406. PINḤAS B. SOLOMON of Lunel, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 115 nr. 1044.  
 a Ab 1397 at Padua: cod. de Rossi 501 for his teacher Jehiel b. Mordecai b. Kalonymos.  
 [Psalms with David Kimḥi's commentary].  
 b Elul 1397: cod. D. Kaufmann 34 for Menaḥem b. Abraham.  
 [Samuel Motot, Commentary on Abraham ibn Ezra's Commentary on Pentateuch].  
 c [s. a.]: cod. Laurent. Pl. 88, 33 (Cat. p. 499).  
 [Zidkia b. Abraham שבלי הלקט Part II, not identified by Biscioni].
407. REPHAEL  
 a Adar 30, 1403: Br. Mus. 190.  
 [הגן ספר Tosaphot on Pentateuch], cf. Aptowitzer in REJ 51 p. 72 sq.
408. REPHAEL B. EPHRAIM da Modena in Firenze, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 115 nr. 1073; Cassuto, Firenze 183. 190.  
 a Tammuz 24, 1486: cod. de Rossi 1365.  
 [Medical treatises], cf. HB XXI, p. VIII, a copy is: cod. Berlin 62 written 1585 at Spezzano by Samuel b. Menaḥem.  
 b 1487 at Firenze: cod. Bibl. Nazionale Centr. di Firenze, vol. I, fasc. 2 Firenze 1889, p. 137–138.  
 [Avicenna, Canon transl. by Joseph Lorki Book 1.]
409. REPHAEL B. LEVI HA-NAKDAN ZARFATI, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 115 nr. 1078; Cassuto, Firenze 34.  
 a 1463: cod. de Rossi 767 for Jacob Toscanello.  
 [Maḥzor rite of Rome], cf. ZfHB XIX, 126–127.  
 b Adar 5, 1468: cod. Oxford 47 for David b. Joab, cf. Zunz, Ges. Schriften III, 175.  
 [Pentateuch].  
 c [15th cent.]: cod. Angelica 8 for Shemtob b. Jacob Toscanello.  
 [Punctuation in Hagiographa]
410. REPHAEL B. SAMUEL b. Benjamin Rophe, cf. Berliner, Ges. Schriften I, 117 nr. 98.  
 a Dec. 29, 1486: cod. Ambrosiana 115.  
 [מאמר השכל ascribed to Eliezer b. Nathan].
411. SAMUEL, cf. Blondheim, Liste, p. 19, nr. 84.  
 a [probably 15th cent.]: cod. Kennicott 108 = cod. Br. Mus. 234.  
 [Pentateuch with Targum and Rashi].

412. SAMUEL OF טרנטו. OTRANTO HA-SOFER (11th cent.), mentioned in the colophon poem of Nathan b. Jehiel's ערוך, cf. MGWJ IV, 360, cf. Steinschneider, *Vorlesungen über der Kunde hebräischer Handschriften*, p. 52.
413. SAMUEL CALLED זימליין SIMLEIN B. BARUCH,  
 a Tammuz 10, 1483 at Brescia: cod. Ambrosiana 109 for his pupil Baruch b. Samuel of Mortara.  
 [Isaac ibn Sahula משל הקדמוני].
414. SAMUEL B. DAVID הכותב דסמטיאה (?) of the family יוסני(?) sold before 1369 at Ancona cod. Kennicott 349 = cod. Paris 54 to Benjamin b. Nathanael קנרוט Canroth cf. HB VII, 117, cf. Shabbethai b. Judah b. Benjamin Canroth nr. 438.
415. SAMUEL B. DAVID IBN SHOHAM, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 118 nr. 1194. *Revue orientale* II, 124.  
 a 1465: cod. Paris 1182 N. 7.  
 [Mesue, *Canones generales*], cf. H Ueb. 718.  
 b Tishri 25, 1474 at Cotrone: cod. Sassoon 409 (Cat. p. 81).  
 [מושב זקנים, a commentary on the Pent. in the style of the Tosaphists].
416. SAMUEL IBN הסוס [READ דייסוס DEISOS], cf. CB 3039; ZfHB XVIII, 118 nr. 1195.  
 a Nisan 14, 1463 at Pisa: cod. Vat. 352.  
 [Aristoteles ס' המדות Nicom. Ethic transl. by Meir Algadez], cf. H Ueb. 210.
417. SAMUEL B. ELIEZER, cf. REJ III, 230.  
 a Adar I. 12, 1468: cod. Nimes 13719.  
 [Levi b. Gershon, *Commentary on the Pentateuch*].
418. SAMUEL B. HAYYIM ZARFATI.  
 a [14th cent.]: cod. J. Kauffmann, Frankfurt a. M., Kat. 11 (1883) p. 2, nr. 2 = Kat. 14 (1889) p. 96 nr. 66.  
 [Maḥzor rite of Rome].
419. SAMUEL B. JEHI'EL da Pisa in Firenze, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 118 nr. 1207; *Rivista Israelitica* VI, 169; Cassuto, Firenze 190 is not the scribe of cod. de Rossi 1296 [Mishne Tora book III]; he wrote only the entries in cod. de Rossi 1296 published by D. Kaufmann in REJ XXVI, 87 nr. 3, see: Menaḥem of Terracina.

420. SAMUEL B. JEḤIEL B. JEKUTIEL, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 118 nr. 1206; Magazin II, 85: Berliner, Ges. Schriften I, 96–97; Bernheim, Paleografia ebraica, p. 273.  
 a [13th cent.]: cod. de Rossi 699 for Menaḥem. *Model-codex for scribes*.  
 [Pentateuch and Megillot], cf. Steinschneider, Vorlesungen über die Kunde hebr. Handschriften p. 6 n. 18.
421. SAMUEL B. JOSEPH HA-KOHEN.  
 a [15th cent.]: cod. D. Kaufmann 530.  
 [Jedaiah Penini בְּחִינַת עוֹלָם].
422. SAMUEL FINZI B. JOSEPH de Ariano, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 118 nr. 1205.  
 a Elul 10, 1492: cod. de Rossi 1173.  
 [David Kimḥi, Commentary on Prophets].
423. SAMUEL HA-ROPHE B. MATATIA רוֹמְיֵי רוֹסוֹ, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 45 nr. 1922; ibid. p. 118 nr. 1223.  
 a 1478 at Cosenza: cod. Bisliches 56 = cod. Oxford 1282.  
 [Hillel of Verona תַּנְמוּלֵי הַנֶּפֶשׁ].  
 b [s. a.]: cod. Oxford 1376.  
 [Averroes' de Substantia Orbis], cf. Cat. Neubauer Add. p. 1157–58.
424. SAMUEL B. MEIR, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 118 nr. 1215; Blondheim, Liste p. 29 nr. 173; Ecrivains 615.  
 a Iyyar 5, 1342: cod. Paris 1028.  
 [Astronomical tables]  
 b [14th cent.]: cod. Oxford 197.  
 [Rashi on Pentateuch].
425. SAMUEL B. MESHULLAM, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 118 nr. 1222.  
 a Iyyar 5, 1395: cod. Oxford 1409.  
 [Jeḥiel b. Jekutiel מַעֲלֹת הַמִּדּוֹת].
426. SAMUEL B. MOSES of Civitanova, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 118 nr. 1219.  
 a Nisan 2, 1425: cod. de Rossi 319.  
 [Bible].
427. SAMUEL B. SOLOMON, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 118 nr. 1231.  
 a Tammuz, 1385: cod. de Rossi 1075.  
 [David Kimḥi ס' הַשְּׂרָשִׁים].



428. SAMUEL B. SAMUEL DA MODENA.  
 a Tammuz 24, 1475: cod. Jew. Theol. Semin. written at age of 14 years.  
 [Judah Messer Leon לבנת הספיר].  
 b April 2, 1478 at קיארפו. (Chiarpò?): cod. Berlin 28.  
 [David Kimḥi, Commentary on Minor Prophets].  
 c [before 1483]: cod. Paris 614.  
 [Maḥzor rite of Rome].
429. SAMUEL B. SHEMTOB of Sforno, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 118 nr. 1234.  
 a [14th cent.]: cod. de Rossi 324.  
 [Jozereth].
430. SAMUEL B. SIMSON NAKDAN b. Samuel, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 118 nr. 1235; Zunz ZG 208.  
 a [13th cent.]: cod. de Rossi 1215.  
 [Maḥzor].
431. SAMUEL ISAIAH B. SHABBETHAI Sorrentino, cf. Blondheim, Liste p. 28 nr. 170.  
 a Marḥesvan 8, 1466 at Eboli (Prov. Salerno): cod. Oxford 190.  
 [Rashi on Pentateuch].
432. SAMUEL OF VERONA, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 118 nr. 1193; HB VI, 128. החלוץ II, 25.  
 a Elul 1449: cod. Oxford 2250 N. 4.  
 [Hebrew translation of Maimonides' introduction to חלק].
433. SHABBETHAI B. JEḤIEL b. Moses Rophe in Rome, cf. Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 452; Blondheim, Liste p. 42 nr. 303; Zunz, ZG 212; Ltbl., IX, 309.  
 a 1384–85 at Montepulciano בחר פולצ': cod. Vat. 46.  
 [Rashi on Pentateuch].  
 b [s. a.]: cod. Br. Mus. 1039.  
 [Calendar tables], cf. Margoliouth Cat. III, p. 369.
434. SHABBETAÏ B. JOEL (OR JOAB) ḤAYYIM b. Shabbetai Rophe in Taco, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 116 nr. 1092; Zunz in Benjamin of Tudela II, 22.  
 a Tebet 24, 1447: cod. Vittorio Emanuele 9 (Cat. p. 46).  
 [More Nebukhim].  
 b Iyyar 19, 1462: cod. Oxford 2310.  
 [Judah Romano בן פורת].

435. SHABBETHAI B. JOSEPH called Bonfils, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 116 nr. 1090.  
 a 1452: cod. Paris 363.  
 [Eliezer b. Judah ירקח].
436. SHABBETHAI B. JOSUA of Tivoli.  
 a Elul 17, 1474 at Naples: cod. Neofiti 5 for Shemtob Teglio b. Abraham.  
 [David Kimḥi, Commentary on Isaiah]  
 b Shebat 1488 at Fiorentino (Ferentino): cod. Br. Mus. 194 for Samuel (האר"י שבחבורה) b. Menaḥem  
 [Abraham ibn Ezra, Commentary on Pentateuch] [162 leaves written in eleven weeks].
437. SHABBETHAI LEVI in Ascoli and Siena, cf. Magazin VIII, 114. see: (Solomon) Shabbethai b. Judah ha-Levi.
438. SHABBETHAI B. JUDAH b. Benjamin קנרוth Canroth, cf. HB VII, 117, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 116 nr. 1091; Zunz in Benjamin of Tudela II, 21; Blondheim, Liste p. 34 nr. 220.  
 a Shebat 2, 1322: cod. Kennicott 554 = cod. de Rossi 5.  
 [Pentateuch with Targum and Rashi and Naḥmanides' Commentary].
439. SHABBETHAI B. LEVI b. Shabbethai b. Elia b. Moses Shabbethai, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 116 nr. 1093; Zunz in Benjamin of Tudela II, 21.  
 a Sivan 10, 1394: cod. Vat. 214.  
 [Collectanea of cabbalistic treatises].
440. SHABBETHAI B. MENAḤEM CANRUTO קנרוth, cf. HB VII, 117] b. Shabbethai b. Juda, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 116 nr. 1096; Zunz in Benjamin of Tudela II, 21.  
 a Tammuz 2, 1380: cod. de Rossi 1070 for Solomon of Pisa, cf. Rivista israel. V, 231.  
 [David Kimḥi, Commentary on Prophets].  
 b Nisan 3, 1381 at Foligno: cod. Perreau 24 [HB VII, 117] for Abraham ha-Rophe b. Samuel.  
 [Moses of Coucy סמ"ג].  
 c Adar 8, 1403: cod. de Rossi 61.  
 [Maḥzor rite of Rome] cf. ZfHB XIX, 49.
441. SHABBETHAI B. MENAḤEM IMMANUEL in Perugia, cf. ZfHB

XVIII, 116 nr. 1095; Zunz, *Ges. Schriften* III, 174, Zunz in Benjamin of Tudela II, 22.

- a Marḥesvan 13, 1408 at Perugia: cod. de Rossi 1126.  
[Psalms].

442. SHABBETHAI B. MESHULLAM, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 116 nr. 1100.

- a Iyyar 14, 1310: cod. Paris 320.

[Judah יעלה b. Benjamin, Commentary on Isaac Alfasi's Halakhot].

- b Tammuz 3, 1316: cod. de Rossi 738 for Moses b. Abraham.  
[David Kimḥi, שרשים].

443. SHABBETHAI B. MORDECAI DA SULMONA b. Shabbethai מברולי di Beroli or Veroli, cf. CB 2478. Cassuto, Firenze 263,

- a Ab 2, 1481: cod. Vittorio Emanuele 4 (Cat. p. 42).

[Levi b. Gershon, Commentary on Job].

444. SHABBETHAI B. NISSIM called עטרות in Reggio di Calabria. cf. ZfHB XVIII, 116 nr. 1101.

- a Ab 10, 1475 at Reggio: cod. Nationalbibliothek in Wien 194 (Cat. p. 224) for Isaac b. Shemtob ha-Kohen.

[Ptolemaeus, Almagest].

445. SHABBETHAI דמנשי [DE MANSI]? B. SAADIA in קמרטא Camerata?, [not listed by Zunz in Benjamin of Tudela II. 23].

- a Shebat 24, 1492: cod. Paris 831 N. 5.

[Prophiat Duran מעשה אפור].

446. SHABBETHAI B. SAMUEL,<sup>49</sup> cf. ZfHB XVIII, 116 nr. 1103.

- a 979: cod. Kennicott 225 = cod. Urb. 2.

[Bible].

447. SHABBETHAI B. ZERAḤ צבתניל in Syracuse (Sicily), cf. ZfHB XVIII, 116 nr. 1088; Zunz ZG 521–22.

- a Adar 12—Nisan 25, 1489 at Syracuse: cod. Vat. 91 for Shalom Jerushalmi b. Solomon b. Saadia.

[Levi b. Gershon, Commentary on Proverbs, Ezra and Neḥemia, Daniel and Chronicles].

<sup>49</sup> Missed by Zunz in Benjamin of Tudela II, 20 sq. Steinschneider, *Vorlesungen über die Kunde hebräischer Handschriften* p. 52 is not sure that he is Italian, cf. the detailed description of cod. Urb. 2 by R. Gottheil in ZfHB IX, 182. Bruns and de Rossi assume 12th–13th cent.



- b Ab 23, 1489 at Syracuse: cod. Vat. 207 for Israel אֶתְאֵן Athan cf. JQR XI, 341.  
[Zohar on Genesis], cf. Zunz, ZG 522.
448. SHALOM JERUSHALMI B. SOLOMON b. Saadia b. Zakhariah b. Hiyya b. Jacob in Syracuse, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 116 nr. 1108; Zunz, ZG 521.
- a Iyyar 13, 1483 in Syracuse:<sup>50</sup> cod. Vat. 379.  
[Ten mathematical and astronomical treatises].
449. SHALOM B. SOLOMON, cf. D. Kaufmann, Ges. Schriften III, 190.
- a Nisan 11, 1484: cod. D. Kaufmann 379 for his father-in-law Jekutiel b. Isaac.  
[Mahzor Italian rite].
450. SHEALTIEL B. JOSEPH OHEB, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 115 nr. 1083. Zunz, Litg. 727, Zunz in Benjamin of Tudela II, p. 6.
- a Ab 28, 1444 at Piacenza: cod. de Rossi 269 for Solomon b. Isaac de Leon.  
[Job with Levi b. Gershon's Commentary and Aboth with Maimonides' Commentary].
451. SHEALTIEL [son of the grammarian] JOSEPH B. JUDA ז"ר קר Zarko ha-Sofer,<sup>51</sup> cf. ZfHB XVIII, 115 nr. 1084; Ozar Nechmad II, 232.
- a 1456: cod. Oxford 1487.  
[Prophiat Duran מַעֲשֵׂה אֶפְרַיִם] [Shealtiel Zarko sold it on Friday the 22nd of October 1456 to Judah b. Solomon Ḥasdai].
452. SHEMARIAH B. ABRAHAM JEḤIEL in Firenze, [author of the medical treatise in cod. Casanata 194 N. 13, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 46 nr. 1952], cf. ZfHB XVIII, 119 nr. 1251; Zunz, Ges. Schriften III, 207, Blondheim, Liste p. 16 nr. 59; Cassuto, Firenze 189. 273.
- a Adar 17, 1470 at Gubbio: cod. de Rossi 1007 for Samuel b. Jekutiel da Gubbio.  
[Mahzor].

<sup>50</sup> Parts of cod. Vat. are written: Part I: 28 of Sephira 1483; Part 2: Sivan 17, 1482; Part 3: Marḥesvan 2, 1482; Part 4: Elul 10, 1483; Part 6: Kislev 26, 1487; Part 7: Modena 1499; Part 9: Adar II 28, 1484.

<sup>51</sup> About the name Zarko, cf. Loeb in REJ XVI, 33 n. 2, HB XVIII, 115 n. 1; CB 1524.

- b Tebet 10, 1480 at Firenze: cod. Casanata 48 (Cat. p. 511) for Jehiel da Pisa b. Isaac cf. Zunz, *Ges. Schriften* III, 207. Cassuto, Firenze 188–189.  
[Added Haphtaroth to Pentateuch with Rashi].
- c 1480: cod. Merzbacher 90.  
[סליחות].
- d Adar 23, 1482: cod. Leyden 80 (Cat. p. 298)  
[Rashi on Pentateuch].
- e Sivan (7.) 15, 1484: cod. de Rossi Cat. III p. 191 nr. 7 for Gentile, daughter of Isaac b. Imanuel da S. Miniato.  
[Prayers in Italian], cf. Cassuto in *REJ* 89 (1930) p. 267 and n. 3; Cassuto in *Festschrift Kaminka* p. 140 nr. 41, Cassuto in *Rivista israel.* VI, 21. 111.
453. SHEMTOB B. ABRAHAM, cf. *ZfHB* XVIII, 117 nr. 1171; *Ltbl.* d. *Orients* 1850 p. 556; VI, 148; J. M. Hillesum in *Vrijdagavond* III. 12. Nov. 1926 p. 113.
- a 1282: cod. F. Friedmann (Amsterdam).  
[Isaiah di Trani, פסקים on Moed and Halakot Ketanot].
454. SHEMTOB B. MOSES OF FARO (פארה) Sephardi.
- a Ab 28, 1413 at Cesena: cod. Jew. Theol. Semin.  
[Joseph Gikatilia ס' האורה].
- b Adar 16, 1437 at Cesena: cod. Paris 1236 for Judah of Meldola.  
[David Kimḥi, ס' השרשים].
455. SHEMTOB B. SAMUEL BARUCH in Bologna, cf. *ZfHB* XVIII, 117 nr. 1178; Berliner, *Ges. Schriften* I, 14. 113; Blondheim, *Liste* p. 22 nr. 117.
- a Iyyar 18, 1399 at Bologna: cod. Sassoon 67 (Cat. p. 74).  
[Menahem of Recanati, Commentary on Pent.]
- b Nisan, 1400 at Bologna: cod. de Rossi 454 for Joel b. Isaac.  
[Abraham ibn Ezra, Commentary on Pent.]
- c Shebat, 1401: cod. Meiningen, Herzogliche öffentliche Bibliothek.  
[David Kimḥi, Commentary on Psalms], cf. Fr. Delitzsch in *Serapeum* 1859 Nr. 24 p. 370.
- d Elul, 1401: cod. Ambros. 24 for Solomon [Jedidiah] b. Matatiah.  
[Rashi on Pentateuch].

- e Nisan, 1404: cod. Paris 76.  
[Targum Onkelos].
456. SHEMTOB, cf. HB V, 107.  
a Sivan 29, 1459: cod. Almanzi 212 = cod. Br. Mus. 1005 for Samuel of Modena b. Moses.  
[Abraham bar Ḥiyya חשבון המהלכות].
457. SIMḤA B. JOSEPH, cf. Ginsburg, Introduction to the Masoretico-Critical edition of the Hebrew Bible, p. 498; Neubauer in Israel. Letterbode XI, 158 nr. 2.  
a 1216: cod. Kennicott 129 = cod. Ginsburg 7 = cod. Br. Mus. 68.  
[Pentateuch with Targum, Megillot and Haphtarot].
458. SIMON B. SIMSON HA-LEVI, cf. Berliner, Ges. Schriften I, 15.110–111; Blondheim, Liste p. 22 nr. 113.  
a [before 1469]: cod. Kennicott 189 = Ambrosiana 14 for Uziel [b. Uacob] with Index by Abraham b. Mordecai Farissol; [see 33a].  
[Pentateuch with Targum and Rashi, Abraham ibn Ezra, Menaḥem of Recanati, Ḥiskiah b. Manoaḥ, etc.]
459. SIMSON ZARFATI B. ELIA ḤALFAN in Firenze, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 119 nr. 1254; Cassuto, Firenze 190–191. D. Kaufmann, Ges. Schriften III, 207; A. Berliner, Aus Handschriften in David Hoffmann Festschrift, p. 290.  
a 1494: cod. de Rossi 878<sup>52</sup> for Menaḥem b. Meshullam of Terracina.  
[Pentateuch with Targum and Rashi], cf. Blondheim, Liste p. 38 nr. 267.  
b [1506 at Marano from a copy of the year 1288 for Eliezer b. Menaḥem Malacola Maḥzor, rite of Rome in two volumes: cod. Porges, cf. Rudolph Hönisch, Leipzig Liste 3 nr. 23, now: Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliothek].
460. SIMSON B. MORDECAI, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 119 nr. 1261.  
a Kislev 1, 1285: cod. de Rossi 93 for Isaac b. Gershom.  
[Moses of Coucy מֹשֶׁה סֻסְיָה].

<sup>52</sup> Not 1108 cf. Berliner, Ges. Schriften I, 12 n. 5.



461. SIMSON OF CITTA DI CASTELLO.  
 a July 1311 at Vittoria?: cod. Casanata 172 (Cat. p. 586) for his pupil.  
 [Joseph Gikatilia שְׁעֵרִי אֹרֵחַ].
462. SOLOMON, cf. Blondheim, Liste p. 18 nr. 75.  
 a Kislev 1, 1427: cod. Br. Mus. 181 for Moses b. Solomon Rophe.  
 [Rashi on Pentateuch].
463. SOLOMON B. BARUCH b. Ezekiel.  
 a Adar 8, 1467 at Cosenza: cod. Casanata 120.  
 [Mishne Tora ס' מֵדָע וְאִרְבָּה].
464. SOLOMON B. ELIA ISRAEL[1],<sup>53</sup> cf. ZfHB XVIII, 116 nr. 1119; Blondheim, Liste p. 43 nr. 311.  
 a Tebet 17, 1371: cod. Urb. 8 for his brother Ahron.  
 [Rashi on Pentateuch].  
 b Mai 1414: cod. Berlin 241.  
 [Matthaeus Platearius, Circa instans], cf. ZfHB XVIII, 40, nr. 1832.
465. SOLOMON B. EPHRAIM מְבֹנְטְרִיאוֹ, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 116 nr. 1122; ibid. 40 nr. 1831.  
 a Kislev 3, 1480: cod. Hamburg 309 N. 3.  
 [Petrocello פִּיטְקָא Curae].
466. SOLOMON B. ḤASDAI, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 116 nr. 1130; Blondheim, Liste p. 12 nr. 25. Zunz, Zeitschrift 351 nr. 17.  
 a Kislev 1396 at Ferrara: cod. Laurent. Pl. II, 1 (Cat. p. 165) for Benjamin b. Menahem de Corinaldo cf. Cat. p. 230, cf. Cassuto, Firenze 29, 358.  
 [Bible with Commentaries of Rashi, Abraham ibn Ezra, David Kimḥi and Levi b. Gershon].  
 b 1414: cod. Laurent. Pl. III, i (Cat. p. 348).  
 [Pentateuch with Targum, Hagiographa].
467. SOLOMON B. ISAAC, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 117 nr. 1144.  
 a [15th cent.]?: cod. Oxford 895 for Moses of Sermione.  
 [Ahron ha-Levi ס' הַחִינוּךְ].

<sup>53</sup> Solomon b. Elia Benjamin mentioned in cod. de Rossi 13.

468. SOLOMON B. IMMANUEL, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 117 nr. 1158.  
 a Sivan, 1284 at Terracina: cod. de Rossi 256.  
 [Psalms with David Kimḥi's Commentary].
469. SOLOMON B. JACOB, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 117 nr. 1143.  
 a Sivan 14, 1415: cod. de Rossi 1097 for Daniel b. Isaac.  
 [David Kimḥi, Commentary on Psalms].
470. SOLOMON JEDIDIAH B. JUDAH,<sup>54</sup> cf. Angelo di Capua, Cat.  
 p. 49 nr. 17.  
 a Elul 1394: cod. Vittorio Emanuele 17.  
 [Joseph Gikatilia, שערי אורה].
471. SOLOMON JEDIDIAH B. LEVI.  
 a 1433 at Forli: cod. Gunzbourg 81.  
 [Jeḥiel b. Jekutiel מעלות המדות].
472. SOLOMON JEDIDIAH B. MOSES (b. Joseph) in Rome, cf.  
 CB 2001; Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 277.  
 a Ḥesvan 18, 1272 at Viterbo: cod. Br. Mus. 904.  
 [Maimonides מורה נבוכים].
473. SOLOMON JEDIDIAH B. MOSES b. Mordecai of Camerino, cf.  
 Weinberg, Die hebr. Handschriften der Landesbibliothek  
 Fulda, 1929, S. 19–20.  
 a Marḥesvan 1, 1395 at Tolentino (on Chicati): cod. Fulda  
 Ba 2 for Menaḥem Zemaḥ b. Moses.  
 [Collectanea of cabbalistical works].
474. SOLOMON B. JEḤIEL b. Abraham ha-Rophe [Anaw] in Rome  
 [nephew of Zidkia Anaw], cf. ZfHB XVIII, 117 nr. 1139;  
 ibid. XVII, 65 nr. 25; ibid. XIX, 140; HB X, 103; Zunz,  
 Ges. Schriften III, 161; CB 2767; Berliner, Geschichte der  
 Jud. in Rom II, 1 p. 127, Berliner, Masora z. Targum On-  
 kelos p. XXIII; Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 278. Magazin I, ii;  
 Zunz, Litg. 352.  
 a Adar I, 23, 1292: cod. Casanata 11.  
 [Targum Onkelos on Pentateuch].  
 b Marḥesvan 14, 1297: cod. Parma 3536=cod. Perreau 20  
 (Cat. p. 159).  
 [סליחות rite of Rome].

<sup>54</sup> Solomon Jedidiah b. Judah ו'ל di Fano sold cod. Vittorio Emanuele 27 to Levi b. Jacob di Terni in צויטא ד'שי' in the year 1482.

- c Nisan 8, 1309: cod. Schulting 13 for . . . b. Abraham.  
[Bible Frgm.], cf. Corn. Schulting, *Bibliotheca Schultingiana*, Amsterdam 1726 cod. 13; Wolf BH IV, 81.
475. SOLOMON B. JOSEPH, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 116 nr. 1133; Magazin II, 57.
- a Kislev 11, 1342 at Ascoli: cod. de Rossi 573 for his teachers Moses and Judah b. Shabbethai.  
[Proverbs with Immanuel b. Solomon's Commentary].
- b Nisan 28, 1346: cod. Vat. 71 for Nathan b. Abraham [de Platea].  
[David Kimḥi, Commentary on Prophets].
- c Nisan 2, 1348 at אספילו Spello: cod. Paris 609 for Obadia b. Moses.  
[Maḥzor rite of Rome].
- d [s. a.]: cod. Paris 839 for his teacher (Arje Judah)?  
[Shemtob ibn Gaon כהר שם טוב].
476. SOLOMON B. JUDAH גרני of Aire; cf. Cat. Berlin I, 89 nr. 112, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 116 nr. 1132.
- a Adar 12, 1447 at Ferrara: cod. Br. Mus. 1035 for Elia Rophe b. Shabbethai.  
[Nathan Palquera צרי הגוף].
477. SOLOMON B. NATHAN, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 117 nr. 1152.
- a Ab 27, 1485 at Lecce: cod. de Rossi 89 for Daniel b. Jacob de Benosa.  
[Pentateuch and Psalms].
478. SOLOMON B. NATHANAEEL [כ"כ"י = Estella], cf. Gallia Jud. p. 52 sq., cf. ZfHB XVIII, 117 nr. 1155.
- a Ab 15, 1400: cod. Firenze, Collegio Israel. (Montefiore nr. 1243).  
[Menaḥem of Recanati פסקי הלכות], cf. Rivista Israel. IV, 174.
- b Kislev 20, 1404: cod. Adler-Stroock = Jew. Theol. Seminary for Shalom b. Samuel.  
[Josef Gikatilia, ס' האורה]
- c Adar, 1405: Urb. 31 for Joshua b. Joab, cf. Zunz, *Ges. Schriften* III, 174.  
[Treatises by Joseph Gikatilia and other cabbalists].



479. SOLOMON B. REPHAEL, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 117 nr. 1161.  
 a [15th cent.]: cod. de Rossi 1315 for Jehiel b. Moses.  
 [Menaḥem of Recanati הלכות פסקי].  
 b [15th cent.]: cod. Halberstam 237 = Hirschfeld 128.  
 [Zidkia b. Abraham שבלי הלקט Part II].
480. SOLOMON HA-SOFER B. SAMUEL לאנ"ם (Laghes Ladjis, cf. H. Ueb. 44), cf. cod. Neofiti 4, cf. Blondheim, Liste 41 nr. 287.  
 a Adar 2, 1483 at רינדא: cod. Berlin 80 for his son Samuel.  
 [Isaiah di Trani jun., Commentary on Tractate Ḥullin].  
 b Elul 14, 1363 (!?): cod. Casanata 43 for Shabbethai b. Moses.  
 [Rashi on Pentateuch].
481. SOLOMON B. ZIDKIA in Rome, [probably a son of the author of שבלי הלקט], cf. Vogelstein u. Rieger I, 278.  
 a Kislev 25, 1288: cod. Berlin 30 for Jehiel b. Nathan.  
 [Mishne Tora Vol. IV].  
 b 1316: cod. Paris 715.  
 [Jehiel b. Jekutiel Anaw, מעלות המדות].
482. SOLOMON DE PISANO, cf. Berliner, Ges. Schriften I, 124.  
 a Ab 4, 1382: cod. Naples III F. 13 for Menaḥem b. Matatia b. Moses in Bologna.  
 [David Kimḥi, מכלול].
483. SOLOMON SAMUEL PRIVAT פריואט.  
 a [before 1346]: cod. Paris 1186 N. 2 for Joseph פרייר [Ferrier, cf. Gallia Jud. 382].  
 [Isaac b. Solomon Israeli, על השתן], see: Ḥalafta b. Abraham of Marseille.
484. (SOLOMO) SHABBETHAI B. JUDAH HA-LEVI, cf. Berliner in Magazin VIII, 114.  
 a 1426 at Siena: cod. Israel. Kultusgemeinde in Wien 34 (Cat. p. 20) for Moses b. Abraham in Siena.  
 [Excerpt from Isaac b. Judah's רוא].
485. TANḤUM B. MOSES of Beaucaire, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 119 nr. 1276; CB 2265; Gallia Jud. 121; Rivista Israel. VI, 102.  
 a 1425 at קשמילי Castel Durante i. e. Urbania (Pope's Territory): cod. Oxford 1335 for Solomon b. Joshua.  
 [Moses ibn Tibbon, Translation of רעיוניות], cf. H. Ueb. 287.

486. TODROS MERWAN **השניירי**. SHENIRI, cf. HB XX, 21; Gallia Jud. 361; Cassuto, *Manoscritti Palatini*, p. 45. 115.  
 a 1457: cod. Vat. 262 for Giannozzo Manetti.  
 [מורה נבוכים].
487. YAQAR called Weidel **שליח דרבנן כותב ובודק הפילין**, b. Simon Weidel of Passau, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 109 nr. 733.  
 a 1473: cod. de Rossi 594.  
 [Haphtarot], cf. ZfHB XI, 89 nr. 52.  
 b Sivan to Tammuz 1476: cod. de Rossi 1338.  
 [שער השמים].  
 c 1499 at טערזנינה (Prov. Venice): cod. D. Kaufmann, 91.  
 [Abraham Klausner, הלכות שחיטה].
488. ZERAḤ B. DAVID, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 64 nr. 314.  
 a [Marḥeshvan 1, 1476]: cod. Paris 428 for Ahron b. Samuel.  
 [טור אורח חיים].  
 b 1483: cod. Turin 110 for Eliezer b. Asher ha-Levi.  
 [טור אורח חיים].
489. ZERAḤIAH B. JUDAH, cf. ZfHB XVIII, 64 nr. 317.  
 a Shebat 27, 1396: cod. Urb. 18 for Solomon b. Matatia.  
 [Levi b. Gershon, Commentary on Job].
490. ZIDKIAH B. MOSES HA-ROPHE in Rome.  
 a Ab 13, 1260: cod. Porges = cod. Sassoon 539 (Cat. p. 161) for Joab b. Meshullam.  
 [Zidkiah b. Abraham, שבלי הלקט], cf. Rudolph Hönisch, Leipzig Liste 3 nr. 46.
491. ZIDKIAH NEHEMIAH B. ELIA b. Zidkiah b. Kalonymos.  
 a Tammuz 9, 1403 at San Severino on the Potenza: cod. Turin 36 for Solomon b. Shabbethai.  
 [Abot with Maimonides' Commentary, Zidkiah b. Abraham שבלי הלקט etc.].

## INDEX OF MANUSCRIPTS

The first number is that of the manuscript in its own catalogue. The second is that under which it is listed.

- |                              |                           |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Adler                        | 51: 54b                   |
| 349: 224a                    | 62: 408                   |
| 370: 33s                     | 65: 35a                   |
| 399: 224a                    | 80: 480a                  |
| 399*: 61b                    | 117: 243a                 |
| 1230: 330                    | 118: 204c                 |
| 1396: 33q                    | 119: 339b                 |
| 2007: 44g                    | 208: 69a                  |
| 2553: 176 f.                 | 213: 126a                 |
|                              | 236: 246h                 |
|                              | 241: 464b                 |
| Adler-Stroock                |                           |
| 478b                         |                           |
| Almanzi יוסף יר, Padoue 1864 | Bisliches                 |
| 8: 371a                      | 56: 423a                  |
| 26: 222a                     | 68: 318a                  |
| 62: 94a                      |                           |
| 66: 251c                     | Bologna, Biblioteca della |
| 67: 212a                     | R. Università.            |
| 79: 367a                     | 6: 281a                   |
| 85c: 176c                    | 9: 253a                   |
| 109: 153a                    |                           |
| 152: 309a                    |                           |
| 158: 389a                    | Boston                    |
| 212: 456a                    | Medical Library           |
| 258: 334a                    | 10: 246c; 329c            |
| 263: 66a                     |                           |
| Amsterdam                    | Budapest                  |
| F. Friedmann                 | D. Kaufmann               |
| 453                          | 20: 172a                  |
|                              | 34: 406b                  |
| Asher                        | 91: 487c                  |
| 3: 67a                       | 278: 200c                 |
| 9: 65b                       | 284: 46a                  |
| 13: 208d                     | 286: 87c                  |
| 14: 33t                      | 289: 69b                  |
| 21: 325a                     | 294: 204k                 |
|                              | 379: 449                  |
|                              | 380*: 17c                 |
|                              | 395: 165a                 |
|                              | 528: 183a                 |
|                              | 530: 421a                 |
| Benzian                      |                           |
| 15: 146                      | Cambridge                 |
| 28: 33h                      | University. Library       |
|                              | 72: 28 note               |
| Berlin                       | Add. 376: 104b            |
| 28: 428b                     | Wright. Trinity College   |
| 30: 481a                     | 124 339a                  |
| 32: 39a                      |                           |



- Cincinnati  
Hebrew Union College  
331: 33m  
337: 127a  
676: 15a
- Coronel  
13: 170a  
204 note
- Deinard  
157: 400b
- Firenze  
Bibliotheca Laurenziana  
Pl. I, 31: 74 note  
Pl. II, 1: 466a  
Pl. III, 1: 466b  
Pl. 88 cod. 2: 379  
Pl. 88 cod. 32: 33c  
Pl. 88 cod. 33: 406c  
Pl. 88 cod. 52: 391a  
Pl. 88 cod. 55: 275
- Firenze  
a. Biblioteca Nazionale  
Pal. 529: 336a  
530: 5a  
208b  
408b  
b. Magliabechiana  
III, 41, 7: 184a  
c. Collegio Israelitico  
Montefiore 1243: 478a  
195a
- Firkowitsch  
343-345: 348a
- Frankfurt a. M.  
Merzbacher  
90: 452c
- Fulda  
Landesbibliothek  
Ba. 2: 473a
- Ghirondi  
16: 394a  
31: 312a  
112A: 285a  
114B: 93  
81b
- Christian David Ginsburg, Introduction (London)  
2: 330a  
7: 457a  
20: 64d  
27: 48
- David Gunzbourg, Leningrad  
81: 471a  
122: 193c  
180: 33ea  
255: 207b  
547: 175a  
770: 377c
- Halberstam  
1: 294c  
61: 140a  
90: 357b  
117: 204 a. b. d; 232  
157: 65b  
194: 321a  
198: 161a  
213: 81b  
216: 204o  
237: 479b  
334: 133a  
393: 322b  
438: 335 [JTS]  
262a [Bodl. 2696]
- Halle  
57a
- Hamburg  
a. Levy  
14: 61a  
112: 208d  
b. Stadtbibliothek  
39: 171a  
47: 193f  
156: 193h  
193: 203a  
196: 131a  
264: 258a  
309: 465  
353: 299
- Karl Hirsemann, Leipzig  
Kat. 429 (1914) nr. 1: 108d
- Ch. M. Horowitz (Frankfurt a. M.)  
Cat. I, nr. 139 = Cat. VI, nr. 112:  
142a  
Cat. I, nr. 6: 80a

- Jerusalem  
Nationalbibliothek  
92a
- Karlsruhe  
11: 22b  
14: 32a
- J. Kauffmann (Frankfurt a. M.)  
Cat. XI nr. 2: 418  
Cat. XIV nr. 66: 418  
Cat. XXV nr. 129: 33r  
Cat. LXVI nr. 1758: 33w; 278b
- Kennicott  
50: 169a  
104: 278d  
108: 411a  
120: 300b  
125: 33n  
129: 457a  
136: 226a  
137: 375b  
185: 393b  
189: 458a  
194: 392a  
225: 446a  
226: 342a  
240: 311g  
253: 44f  
349: 414  
394: 311c  
422: 120a  
436: 248a  
446: 144d  
464: 396a  
489: 157  
511: 378a  
525: 281a  
554: 438a  
561: 247a  
564: 264  
567: 74  
574: 358a  
586: 296a
- S. Kirschstein, Berlin  
33ma
- Leipzig  
Ratsbibliothek  
13: 114a  
26: 246d
- Leningrad — Moscow  
David Gunzbourg  
81: 471a  
122: 193c  
180: 33ea  
255: 207b  
547: 175a  
770: 377c
- B. Levy, Hamburg  
14: 61a  
112: 208d
- Leyden  
80: 452d  
Sc. 3: 176d  
Sc. 13: 82a
- Lipschütz  
200g
- Livorno (Leghorn)  
3: 180a  
4: 201a  
65: 400a
- London  
Beth ha-Midrash  
42: 166a  
48: 206
- London,  
British Museum  
68: 457a  
75: 48  
95: 33n  
124: 64d  
148: 389a  
168: 222a  
175: 341a  
179: 330a  
181: 462  
182: 278d  
189: 234  
190: 407a  
192: 51a  
194: 436b  
203: 309a  
210: 44d  
215: 31a  
223: 7a  
234: 411a  
238: 300 a. b.  
376: 125  
485: 204q

505: 178b  
 508: 340a  
 517: 320a  
 523: 200a  
 526: 257a  
 546: 334a  
 615: 214e; 212a  
 616: 367a  
 617: 80a  
 621: 33f  
 622: 33i  
 625: 163a  
 626.627: 151b  
 628: 153a  
 629<sup>16</sup>: 276a  
 744: 141a  
 756: 218b  
 868: 176c  
 882: 128b  
 885: 246c  
 897: 94a  
 904: 472a  
 906: 14a  
 908: 311a  
 914: 15a  
 917: 236b  
 976: 27b  
 1005: 456a  
 1035: 476a  
 1036: 21a  
 1039: 433b  
 1058: 395b  
 1063: 371a  
 1085<sup>2</sup>: 66a  
 1117: 380a  
 1139: 16a

London Jews College (Montefiore Library)

H. Hirschfeld, Descriptive Catalogue

6: 161a  
 15: 81b  
 45: 204o  
 128: 479b  
 213: 140a  
 228: 322b  
 266: 204 a. b. d.; 232  
 269: 294c  
 271: 321a  
 410: 65b  
 415: 357b  
 505: 133a

L. Loewe  
 8<sup>s</sup>: 162b

Samuel David Luzzatto,  
 Catalogue,  
 1868  
 55: 81b  
 65: 159  
 101: 190A

Madrid  
 Bibliot. Nationale  
 G g. nr. 109: 204 f. note

Mantua  
 8: 129  
 82: 230  
 Meiningen  
 Herzogliche Öffentliche Bibliothek  
 455c

Milano  
 Ambrosiana  
 4: 134a  
 5: 393b  
 11: 392a  
 12: 12c  
 14: 33a; 458a  
 16: 120a  
 24: 455d  
 25: 176b  
 28: 179a  
 29. 30: 119a  
 32: 204g  
 36: 110a  
 86<sup>s</sup>: 96a  
 87: 311b  
 91: 294a  
 95: 400a  
 109: 413a  
 115: 410

Modena  
 6: 74c

München  
 97: 308  
 111: 186a  
 117: 140a  
 143: 223a  
 201: 19b  
 232<sup>11</sup>: 177b  
 327: 29a; 207a

Naples  
 III F. 6: 383a  
 III F. 13: 482a



Sigmund Nauheim (Frankfurt a. M.)	47: 409b
92a	79: 54a
	85: 162a
New York	129: 169a; 190a; 239a
Columbia	187: 287a
x 893 — G 363: 365a	189: 288a
	190: 431a
	191: 244
New York	193: 424
Jewish Theological Seminary	203: 90a
12b	218: 58a
33cax	221: 127a; 255a
33o	230: 100c
33q	237: 314b
33s	240: 117a
44g	246: 108b
45a	302: 7b
56a	376: 159A; 333a
59a	441: 152a
59a	541: 53b
104a	556: 404
136c	590: 187a
148a	601: 368a
168a	603: 280b
176f	635: 13; 397c
224a	659: 238a
235	663: 398a
236	697: 44e
288c	708: 112b
313d	711: 352a
324a	859: 385a
335a	867: 362a
400b	876: 190b
401a	879: 159A
428a	895: 467a
454a	980: 63
478b	1052, 1053: 22a
	1057: 108c
Nikolsburg	1068: 29d
Fürstlich Dietrichsteinsche Bibliothek	1071: 204h.
3: 329c	1087: 329b
5: 246c	1124: 112d
	1137: 400c
	1139: 329b
	1173: 14c; 158d
Nîmes	1229: 294e
13719: 417a	1253: 193i
13721: 259a	1277: 204f
128a	1282: 423a
	1319: 227a; 327a
	1335: 485a
Oxford	1373: 178a
Bodleian Library	1376: 423b
13: 200e	1389: 178c
15: 144c	1392: 33d
26: 74a	1409: 425a
44: 137b	1487: 451a

1488: 395	76: 455c
1491: 310 note	81: 54a
1600: 196	89: 477
1605: 302a	114: 278g; 279b; 393d
1748: 399a	148: 279b
1945: 326a	154: 86a
1961: 81a	160: 38a
2023: 10	176: 64a
2083: 182a	182: 351a
2087: 377b	208: 298a
2098: 231a	217: 84a
2124: 121a	234: 126b
2183: 57b	258: 122a
2219: 210	269: 331a
2250 <sup>4</sup> : 432a	308: 302b
2276: 252a	312: 254a
2295: 204p	320: 442a
2310: 434b	328: 329: 208a
2325: 226a	330: 200d
2332: 375b	332: 44a
2381: 204 n.	347: 280c
2408: 373a	363: 435
2426 <sup>3</sup> : 323a	364: 319a
2438: 113a	370: 124a
2450: 374b	372: 200f
2502: 279 note; 393d	390: 279a
2511: 159b	400: 107a
2567: 33b	401: 200b
2636: 24a	422: 402b
2696: 262a	428: 488a
2822 <sup>25</sup> : 295a	599: 174a
2903: 237a	605: 193i
	609: 475c
Padua	611: 375a
Seminario Vescovile	612: 220a; 313c
44c	614: 428c
	627: 79a
Jewish Community	629: 185a
246h	674: 176e
	682: 274a
	740: 11a
Paris	809: 149a
a. Alliance israélite universelle	814: 65a
30: 159	816: 315a
44: 190A	831 <sup>5</sup> : 445a
49: 156a	839: 475d
124: 118 note	926: 198a
b. Ecole Rabbinique de France	932: 178e
39: 95	933: 159a
	968: 283a
	974: 325b
Paris	976: 261a
Biblioth. Nationale	994: 405a
35: 135a	1013: 399
38: 366a	1028: 424a
50: 204s	1034: 164a
54: 414	1125: 311d

1168: 154a  
 1178: 154c  
 1182<sup>7</sup>: 415a  
 1185: 137a  
 1186: 121b; 483a  
 1197: 202a  
 1221: 293c  
 1236: 454b  
 1280: 267  
 1284: 30a

# Parma

de Rossi  
 3: 358a  
 5: 438a  
 6: 204r; 334b  
 7: 393a  
 11: 278e; 284a  
 12: 41. 216a  
 13: 316a  
 14: 281 note  
 58: 190e  
 61: 440c  
 76: 78  
 79: 33k  
 93: 460a  
 94: 268a  
 95: 265a  
 99: 26a  
 102: 374a  
 106: 205A  
 136: 228a  
 145<sup>v</sup>: 33eb  
 148: 370a  
 151: 9a; 117a  
 157: 138a  
 161: 102  
 172: 297  
 180: 193d  
 182: 64c  
 197: 208f  
 204: 213a  
 215: 229a  
 221: 14b  
 234: 191a  
 256: 468a  
 269: 450a  
 272: 294d  
 279: 70a  
 285: 52a  
 286: 19d  
 305: 353a  
 317: 158c  
 319: 426a  
 324: 429a  
 325: 34a  
 326: 178f

331: 53a  
 333: 3a  
 336: 272a  
 351: 306a  
 356: 42a  
 360: 112a  
 369: 190c  
 390: 349a  
 402: 109c  
 403: 402a  
 405: 116a  
 422: 205a  
 450: 158a  
 453: 250a  
 454: 455b  
 463: 145a  
 467: 18a  
 471: 290a  
 475: 314a  
 481: 183 note  
 483: 357c  
 494: 136a  
 501: 406a  
 505: 225a  
 527: 19a  
 532: 133  
 556<sup>a</sup>: 1b  
 558: 73a  
 567: 282a  
 569: 376a  
 573: 475a  
 594: 487a  
 598: 377a  
 601: 15b  
 610: 123a  
 616: 273  
 631: 307a  
 653: 344a  
 657: 333b  
 660: 204e; 263  
 662: 115a  
 667: 192a  
 682: 197a  
 691: 311h  
 692-694: 311e  
 699: 420a  
 728: 251a  
 738: 442b  
 739: 347a  
 741: 249a  
 742: 356a  
 747: 328a  
 750: 338a  
 755: 72a  
 758: 291a  
 767: 409a  
 774: 260



790: 98a  
 801: 278 f  
 803: 245a  
 804: 193k  
 828: 27a  
 854: 189  
 860: 301a  
 868: 190d  
 870: 2a  
 878: 310n; 459a  
 892: 219a  
 896: 13  
 900: 17b  
 926: 101b  
 928: 2  
 930: 97a  
 936: 49a  
 937: 225a  
 940: 359a  
 959: 62a; 181a  
 969: 160  
 973: 387a  
 991: 118a  
 1006: 194  
 1007: 452a  
 1027: 136b  
 1032: 106a  
 1050: 393a  
 1056: 44b  
 1063: 150a  
 1067: 369a  
 1070: 440a  
 1072: 158b  
 1075: 427a  
 1082: 60a  
 1097: 469a  
 1100: 207a, 208g  
 1108: 75a  
 1118: 33p  
 1126: 441a  
 1129: 33g  
 1134: 23a  
 1135: 178a  
 1140: 99a  
 1146: 175b  
 1161: 287b  
 1162: 7a  
 1167: 269a  
 1168: 269b  
 1169: 360a  
 1173: 422a  
 1204: 294b  
 1215: 430a  
 2161: 65c  
 1296: 310. 419  
 1298: 71a  
 1299: 233a, 277a

1315: 479  
 1345: 246 g  
 1365: 408a  
 1371: 209  
 1376: 361a  
 1388: 487b  
 — . —  
 extr. 13:83  
 extr. 55:47a 162a  
 ital. 6: 88a  
 [Cat. vol. III p. 191 nr. 7]: 452c

Parma  
 1380: 266c  
 1385: 126c  
 1386: 107b  
 1390: 293  
 1392: 204l  
 1396: 193a  
 1418: 294 note  
 1420: 313 note; 204m  
 3060: 143a  
 3493: 240b  
 3498: 6a  
 3503: 33l  
 3505: 393c  
 3516: 305a  
 3536: 474b

Perreau  
 1: 33l  
 3: 266c  
 6: 143a  
 8: 126c  
 9: 107b  
 10: 393c  
 13: 293  
 14: 240b  
 15: 204l  
 16: 193l  
 18: 6a  
 19: 193a  
 20: 474b  
 22: 12a  
 23: 271a  
 24: 440b  
 41: 294 note  
 43: 313 note; 204m  
 66: 305 a

Prag  
 Jüd. Gemeindebibliothek  
 7: 173

R. N. Rabinowitz  
 Cat. 3 nr. 2: 330a  
 Cat. 3 nr. 25:360 note

Cat. 3 nr. 32: 322b  
 Cat. 4 (1883) nr. 38: 1a  
 Cat. 7 (1884) nr. 87: 69b  
 Cat. 7 (1884) nr. 146: 33c  
 Cat. 1887 nr. 120: 183a

Rome. Biblioteca Angelica

1<sup>r</sup>: 311g  
 1<sup>r</sup>: 215a  
 1<sup>r</sup>: 311f  
 2: 139a  
 8: 409c  
 14: 36a  
 35: 396a

Rome. Bibliotheca Casanata

10: 144d  
 11: 474a  
 12: 248a  
 22: 248b  
 43: 480b  
 48: 310 note; 452b  
 52: 193b  
 77: 68a  
 117: 75b  
 120: 463a  
 154: 380b  
 155: 332  
 160<sup>r</sup>: 211a  
 172: 461a  
 193: 8a  
 283: 74 note

Rome, Neofiti

1: 304a  
 4: 403a  
 5: 436a  
 14: 76a  
 20: 270  
 27: 281 note  
 29: 186b

Rome, Bibl. Vaticana

6: 342a  
 18: 157a  
 46: 433a  
 47: 357a  
 71: 475b  
 77: 55a  
 91: 447a  
 95: 109a  
 111: 188a  
 163: 4a  
 197: 20a  
 207: 447b  
 214: 439a

260: 77a  
 262: 486a  
 283<sup>r</sup>: 363a  
 292: 388a  
 341: 155a  
 352: 416a  
 361: 85a  
 379: 448a  
 396: 50a  
 408: 109b  
 462: 208e

Rome, Urbinata

2: 446a  
 7: 148a  
 8: 464a  
 17<sup>r</sup>: 105a  
 18: 489a  
 31: 478b  
 32: 59b

Rome

a. Comunità Israelitica  
 83  
 b. Corsini  
 25a  
 c. Talmud Thora  
 19c

Rome, Vittorio Emanuele

3: 382a  
 4: 443a  
 6: 303  
 7: 303; 345a  
 9: 434a  
 10: 298b  
 17: 470a  
 26: 303a  
 27: 470 note

William Roth (New York)  
 33w

Saraval

3: 246b  
 7: 266b  
 12: 108a  
 13: 337a  
 27: 13; 397a  
 41: 43a  
 44: 111a  
 48: 100b; 111b  
 60: 354a  
 61: 91a

- Sassoon  
 23: 17a  
 67: 455a  
 405: 193g  
 409: 415b  
 516: 28a  
 534: 278c  
 539: 490 [Porges]  
 607: 384a  
 707: 167b  
 708: 167a  
 1028: 288b
- Herz Scheyer (Mainz)  
 154b
- Samuel Schoenberg (Berlin)  
 178g
- O. H. Schorr  
 118 note  
 288b
- Cornelius Schulting (Amsterdam)  
 Bibliotheca Schultingiana  
 Amstelodami 1726  
 13: 474c
- Schwager & Fraenkel (Husiatyn)  
 88  
 Cat. X nr. 11: 175a  
 Cat. XI nr. 34: 293a  
 Cat. 57 nr. 16: 33m
- Flaminio Servi  
 33w
- M. Soave (Venice)  
 163a
- Steinschneider  
 12: 236
- Strassburg  
 9: 33t  
 20: 325a
- Sussex  
 12: 266a
- Toledo  
 7: 29b  
 10: 256a  
 378a
- Turin  
 Bibliotheca Regia  
 3: 103  
 5: 322a  
 27: 7a  
 31: 34b; 204t  
 35: 280 note  
 36: 491  
 57: 292a  
 63: 213b  
 71: 280 note  
 75: 280a  
 76: 218b  
 86: 101a  
 104: 118b  
 110: 488b  
 118: 288d  
 120: 29c  
 192: 285b  
 216: 364a  
 218: 276b  
 230: 127 note  
 251: 33u  
 256: 313b
- Venice  
 a. Marciana  
 15: 89a  
 b. Nani  
 47a  
 c. Scuola Israelitica (Talmud Thora)  
 2: 386a  
 4: 132a  
 80b  
 d. Treves  
 5 note
- Verona  
 60: 246f  
 69: 144a  
 397c
- Wien  
 a. Jüdisches Museum  
 158: 74b  
 b. Kultusgemeinde  
 35: 286  
 c. Nationalbibliothek  
 9: 208c  
 34: 484a  
 43: 381a  
 71: 289a  
 95: 240a  
 97A: 313a  
 97B: 144b



136: 346a  
140: 199a  
142: 61a  
162<sup>2</sup>: 228b  
163: 335A  
173: 1  
174: 246a  
194: 444a

Yale  
University Library  
13: 33v

Zelada  
29b  
256a  
378a

Zuckermann  
10: 266b  
37: 111a  
60: 100b; 111b  
64: 337a  
67: 354a  
68: 91a  
93: 246  
102: 108a  
104: 13; 397a  
107: 43a

Zürich  
Zentralbibliothek  
44f  
311c

# INDEX OF PERSONS FOR WHOM MANUSCRIPTS WERE WRITTEN AND NAMES OF CITIES

- Abraham 278f  
 Abraham b. Abigdor 158d  
 Abraham b. Abraham di Norzi 266b  
 Abraham de Balmes 46a; 246a. b. f. 374b  
 Abraham de Finzi of Bologna 294e  
 Abraham in Gubbio 193a  
 Abraham b. Isaac in Rieti 8a  
 Abraham b. Jacob 213b  
 Abraham b. Jehiel of Bologna 354a  
 Abraham b. Joab Finzi of Recanati 391a  
 Abraham b. Joseph Kohen 335b  
 Abraham b. Joseph Kohen in Alessandria 278g; 393d  
 Abraham Rophe b. Judah Rophe 132a  
 Abraham b. Menahem 205A  
 Abraham b. Menahem Alatrino 140b  
 Abraham רבב Rabbâ 74a  
 Abraham ha-Rophe b. Samuel 440b  
 Abraham b. Shemtob 280c  
 Abraham b. Solomon Anaw 178a  
 Abraham of Urbino b. Menahem of Mantua 322a  
 Ahron b. Levi  
 Ahron b. Samuel 488a  
 Ancona 7a. b.; 121b; 141a; 333b; 391a  
 Apice (near Benevento) 198a  
 Aquila 300a; 332  
 Ariano 52a  
 Arje Judah 475d  
 Ascoli 115a; 475a  
 Assisi 23a  
 Avignon 33eb; 352a  
  
 Bari 46a; 272a  
 Barletta 154b  
 Baruch b. Samuel of Mortara 413a  
 Baruch di Peschiera b. Samuel 204e. f.k.l.; 263a  
 Belmonte 81b  
 Bendet Conat 28 note  
 Benjamin b. Elia 159a  
 Benjamin b. Isaac 222a  
 Benjamin b. Isaac 287a  
 Benjamin b. Isaac 326a  
 Benjamin b. Isaac טורני (of Aire) 59b  
 Benjamin b. Menahem de Corinaldo 466a  
  
 Benjamin b. Nathanael קנרוי Canroth 414  
 Benjamin b. Samuel 200a  
 Benjamin b. Samuel of Ancona 125  
 Benjamin b. Solomon of Camerino 190b  
 Berekhiah b. Matatia 188a  
 Bertinoro 80a  
 Bitonto 242a; 329n  
 Bologna 5a. n.; 7n; 12a. b.; 33m; 49a; 137a; 151a; 200d; 306a; 455a. b.  
 Bona 88a  
 Bonaventura Vigevano of Cremona 33f.  
 Brescia 413a  
 Bruneta 74c  
  
 Camerino 190d; 287a  
 Carpi 334a  
 Casale Monferrato 338a  
 Castel Durante (i. e. Urbania) 485a  
 Cento 88a; 144a; 153a  
 Cesena 208a. b.; 360a; 454a. b.  
 Chiarpî (Chiarpî ?) 428b  
 Civilantino 70a  
 Consola 12b  
 Corfu 302b  
 Corneto [Tarquinia] 54a; 377a. b.  
 Cortona 27a; 201a  
 Cosenza 120a.; 403a; 423a; 463a  
 Cotrone 415b  
 Crema 15a.; 285b  
 Cremona 44b; 213b; 250a; 296a  
  
 Daniel 229a  
 Daniel b. Abraham 97a  
 Daniel of Budrio 398a  
 Daniel b. Isaac 469a  
 Daniel b. Jacob de Benosa 477  
 Daniel b. Judah da Norcia 204s  
 Daniel b. Samuel ha-Rophe b. Daniel 288a; 367a  
 Dattilo di Elia da Vigevano in Firenze 33n  
 David b. Abigdor 158d  
 David ha-Rophe b. Elia Zebi 100b; 111a. b  
 David b. Isaac of Revere 204u  
 David b. Joab 409b  
 David b. Joab Immanuel Finzi 57b  
 David b. Menahem Finzi 126b

- David b. Menahem Zarfati da Tricoriga 154a  
 David b. Nathan 122a  
 David b. Solomon da Perugia 151b  
 David of Tivoli 241  
*Digna* 280a
- Eboli* 431a  
 Egidio di Viterbo 304a  
 Elia and his wife Bruneta 74c  
 Elia Beer (Fonte) b. Shabbethai 178g  
 Elia b. Isaac of Mestre 399  
 Elia ha-Rophe b. Isaac 248a  
 Elia b. Joseph שריואל 90a  
 Elia b. Judah Rophe of Rome in Fano 158c  
 Elia b. Menahem 190d  
 Elia Rophe b. Shabbethai 137a  
 Elia Rophe b. Shabbethai 476a  
 Elia b. Solomon of Ravenna 17a  
 Elia b. Zidkia 245a  
 Elieser b. Asher ha-Levi 488b  
 Elieser Rophe b. Menahem 77a  
 Elieser b. Menahem Malacola 459b  
 Elieser of Norzi 228a  
 Elieser b. Samuel of Cesena 204 m  
 Ephraim 293b  
 Ezra b. Isaac 181a  
 Ezra b. Isaac in Perugia 62a
- Fabriziano* 108b; 396a  
*Faenza* 158a  
*Fano* 58a; 109b; 158c; 249a  
 Federico II d'Urbino 40a  
*Fermo* 2n; 33u.; 140a.; 287b  
*Ferrara* 33f. g. l. p. q. r. s. u.; 44a.; 142a.; 159a.; 165a.; 218a.; 291a.; 294b; 322a.; 333a.; 466a.; 476a.  
*Fiorentino* 436b  
*Firenze* 74c; 151b; 408b; 452b  
*Foligno* 440b  
*Forlì* 107b; 294e; 367a; 471a  
*Frascati* 311g  
 Freida (wife of Hayyim Rapa Stein) 92a
- Gallipoli* 246c  
 Gentile bat Isaac b. Immanuel da S. Miniato 452e  
*Genzano* 182a  
 Gershom b. Eliezer 264a  
 Gershom b. Joshua b. Gershom 247a  
 Gershom in Rimini 146a  
*Goriano* 33o  
*Gubbio* 98a; 193a. b. c.; 452a
- Hannah bat Isaiah ha-Sofer 213b  
 Hayyim ha-Rophe 170a
- Immanuel of Camerino 33q  
 Immanuel b. Benjamin in Apice 198a  
 Immanuel b. Isaac in Modena 213a  
 Immanuel b. Menahem of Pavia 123a  
 Immanuel b. Noah Raphael da Norsa in Ferrara 33v. s  
 Immanuel b. Uziel 25a  
*Imola* 34a; 133a; 175a; 375a  
 Isaac Albilia 11a  
 Isaac de Castello 171a  
 Isaac b. Daniel 334a  
 Isaac b. David 157a  
 Isaac Fasi 152a  
 Isaac b. Gershom 460a  
 Isaac b. Hananel 54b  
 Isaac b. Judah 319a  
 Isaac b. Meir Levi 112a  
 Isaac b. Meshullam Rophe b. Joab of Beth-El 193d  
 Isaac Nakdan 48  
 Isaac Parnas Kohen 126c  
 Isaac b. Shemtob ha-Kohen 444a  
 Isaac Yakar Rophe 44c  
 Isaiah b. Reuben 101b  
*Isola della Scala* 44c. d  
*Ispino (Lombardy)* 269a. b  
 Israel Rophe b. Abraham of Ancona 44e  
 Israel עיטן Athan 447b  
 Israel b. Moses 12a
- Jacob 33d  
 Jacob b. Abraham of Mantua 68a  
 Jacob b. David Kalonymos הפילוסוף 400a  
 Jacob b. Judah in Modena 34a  
 Jacob Leon of Cavaillon 323  
 Jacob al-Maani 21a  
 Jacob b. Samuel 31a  
 Jacob b. Samuel 363a  
 Jacob b. Solomon da Perugia 151b  
 Jacob b. Solomon in Rimini 17c  
 Jacob Toscanella 409a  
 Jedidia Solomon b. Shabbethai b. Matatia 17a  
 Jehiel 29c  
 Jehiel Rophe 9a  
 Jehiel b. Abraham 97a  
 Jehiel da Pisa b. Isaac 452b  
 Jehiel b. Jacob מהטוב (Del Bene) 175n  
 Jehiel b. Jekutiel Beth-El 335a  
 Jehiel b. Joab 208f  
 Jehiel b. Joseph Della Rocca 208a



- Jehiel b. Matatia de Synagoga 288b  
 Jehiel b. Mordecai 260a  
 Jehiel b. Mordecai b. Kalonymos 406a  
 Jehiel Rophe b. Moses 52a  
 Jehiel b. Moses 479a  
 Jehiel b. Moses of Monte Fiorito 208b, c, d  
 Jehiel b. Nathan 482a  
 Jehiel b. Zidkia in Rome 218b  
 Jekutiel b. Isaac 449a  
 Jekutiel b. Moses 115a  
 Jekutiel b. Nathan 209a  
 Jekutiel b. Solomon 109c  
 Joab b. Benjamin in Rome 259a; 351; 358a  
 Joab b. Benjamin b. Joab b. Benjamin b. Moses b. Jehiel 7a  
 Joab b. Benjamin b. Solomon  
 Joab Fosco b. Benjamin b. Joab 176b  
 Joab in Fermo 140a  
 Joab Immanuel of Reggio 276a  
 Joab b. Meshullam 490a  
 Joel b. Isaac 153a; 455b  
 Jonatan Jesi (Ghesi) b. Joab in San Severino 315a  
 Joseph b. Abraham 32a  
 Joseph Rophe b. Abraham of Ancona 44e  
 Joseph Caravita 33m  
 Joseph of Fabriano 200d  
 Joseph b. Isaac Gallico 330  
 Joseph b. Joseph in Rimini 71a  
 Joseph b. Mordecai Zarfati 298a  
 Joseph פרייר [Ferrier] 121b; 483a  
 Joseph b. Solomon 112d  
 Joseph b. Solomon Kohen 151a  
 Joseph עניל b. Solomon 58a  
 Joseph Zark 27b  
 Joshua b. Benjamin 193f  
 Joshua b. Joab 478c  
 Judah 33d  
 Judah b. Benjamin Kohen 381a  
 Judah of Camerino 44f; 396a  
 Judah Finzi 309a  
 Judah b. Jekutiel of Camerino 193c  
 Judah of Meldola 454b  
 Judah b. Moses Finzi 324a  
 Judah b. Shabbethai 475a  
 Judah b. Solomon 265a  
 Judah b. Solomon Hasdai 451a  
 Kalonymos b. Kalonymos 207n  
 Lecce 100a, b.; 111a, b.; 164a; 246b, f, g.; 295a; 477a  
 Legnago 286a  
 Leon Gabriel 266c  
 Leon סיני of Cologna 280a  
 Levi b. Gershon 86a  
 Levi b. Joseph 83a  
 Linenara 168a  
 Lucera de' Saraceni 267a  
 Macerata 107a  
 Manetti, Giannozo 109b; 486a  
 Manfredonia 267a  
 Mantua 27b; 33a, d.; 204; 263a; 387a  
 Marano 459b  
 Motatia b. Moses 107a  
 Matatia b. Moses b. Joseph 368a  
 Matatia b. Nathan 28a; 204g  
 Meir 285n  
 Melfi 154a  
 Menahem 420a  
 Menahem b. Abraham 375a  
 Menahem b. Abraham 406b  
 Menahem b. Abraham לבית מאיר 242a  
 Menahem b. Ahron of St. Rambert 103a  
 Menahem b. Benjamin b. Jehiel 14c; 397b  
 Menahem b. Benjamin b. Menahem 176d  
 Menahem b. David Trabotto 279a  
 Menahem b. Isaac of Revere 204r; 334b  
 Menahem b. Jehiel 230a  
 Menahem b. Jehiel 287b  
 Menahem b. Jehiel Gallico in Fermo 347a  
 Menahem b. Jekutiel Finzi 290a  
 Menahem b. Matatia b. Moses in Bologna 482a  
 Menahem b. Menahem 35a  
 Menahem b. Menahem Rophe 345a  
 Menahem b. Meshullam of Terracina 337a; 459a  
 Menahem b. Nathan of Rome in Rimini 200a, b, c, f.  
 Menahem of Ochrida 164a  
 Menahem b. Simson 370a  
 Menahem b. Solomon  
 Menahem Zemah b. Moses 473a  
 Meshullam b. Abraham 193g  
 Meshullam b. Isaac of Ferri 314b  
 Mestre 45a; 92a  
 Mikhael b. Benjamin ha-Rofe 33p  
 Modena 213a  
 Modigliano 29b; 73a  
 Mondovi 121a  
 Montalboddo 163a; 368a

*Montalcino* 50a  
*Montalto* 126c; 395a  
*Monte Camerino* see; *Camerino* 400b  
*Montecchio* 175b  
*Montefusco* 21a  
*Montepulciano* 433a  
 Mordecai b. Abraham Kohen in  
   Naples 219a  
 Mordecai b. Isaac 386a  
 Mordecai b. Isaiah in Termoli 106a  
 Mordecai b. Joab 207a  
 Mordecai b. Judah 51a  
 Mordecai b. Judah of Rome 235a;  
   394a  
 Mordecai d'Osimio 39a  
 Moses 239  
 Moses b. Abigdor 158d  
 Moses b. Abraham 442d  
 Moses b. Abraham in Siena 484a  
 Moses אֶלְפִּלֹּט 113a  
 Moses Anaw 175n  
 Moses ha-Rophe b. Benjamin 193i  
 Moses of Carpi 91a  
 Moses b. David in Forlì 107b  
 Moses b. Isaac of Cesena 120a  
 Moses Rophe b. Isaac b. Baruch  
   178b. c. d. e  
 Moses b. Jehiel ha-Rophe in Bene-  
   vento 128a. b  
 Moses Rophe b. Judah דְּלוֹפֶלְצוֹ 67a  
 Moses b. Judah of Trani 204n  
 Moses b. Judah Rophe 20a  
 Moses b. Judah Rophe of Spello  
   193h  
 Moses Kimhi 85a  
 Moses b. Matatia מֹתָן in Palermo  
   155a  
 Moses of Monreal 233a; 277a  
 Moses b. Mordecai 327  
 Moses b. Nathan 190c  
 Moses Nissim Israel b. Mordecai  
   Shealtiel Israel of Bologna 118c  
 Moses Rieti 77a  
 Moses b. Samuel 169a; 190a  
 Moses b. Saul ha-Levi 204q  
 Moses b. Shabbethai 289a  
 Moses b. Shabbethai 475a  
 Moses b. Solomon Rophe 462a  
 Moses of Sermione 467a  
 Moses of Urbino b. Menaḥem of  
   Mantua 322a  
 Naphtali b. Meshullam 285a  
*Naples* 148a. n.; 235a; 436a  
*Narni* 15b; 60a  
 Nathan b. Abigdor 3a; 158d  
 Nathan b. Abigdor 195a

Nathan b. Abraham [de Platea] 475b  
 Nathan b. Meshullam Rophe b.  
   Abraham b. Joab Beth-El 193d  
 Nathan b. Samuel 220; 313c  
 Nathan Raphael Trabot 114a  
 Nathanael 104a  
 Nathanael b. Abraham in Monte  
   Fiascone 191a  
 Nathanael צִבְעִי of San Severino in  
   Ancona 141a  
 Nathanael b. Shabbethai 44a  
 Nissim b. David חִיָּן 223a  
 Nissim b. Solomon of Ancona 42a  
 Noah b. Immanuel Norzi 333a

*Offida* 81a  
 Rotundo? 58a  
*Osimio* 371a  
*Otranto* 412

*Padua* 132a; 299a; 406a  
*Palermo* 85a  
*Parma* 127a  
*Perugia* 37; 80b; 191a; 193d. e. g.;  
   206a.; 314a 361a; 441a  
*Pesaro* 17a. c.; 68a. c  
*Pescia (Toscana)* 288a  
*Piacenza* 450a  
 Pinḥas ha-Rophe b. Nathanael 236a  
*Pieve di Sacco* 386a  
*Pisa* 80b; 416a  
*Porcia* 76a; 82a  
*Porto Bufalè (Porto buffole)* 129a  
 פֶּרְלָאָה 273

Raphael of Recanati 17b  
 Raphael b. Daniel 334a  
 Raphael b. Joseph Isaac 117a  
 Raphael Kohen of Lunel in Man-  
   fredonia 267a  
 Raphael of Urbino b. Menaḥem of  
   Mantua 322a  
 Raphael of Fano b. Uziel 175a  
*Ravenna* 294d  
 Rebecca 163a  
*Reggio* 57a. b  
*Revello* 279a  
*Rieti* 30a; 178b. c.; 208f  
*Rimini* 146a; 158b; 200c. d. e.; 328a;  
   334b; 365a  
 רִינְדָא 480a  
*Rome* 65c; 77a; 174a; 178g; 186a;  
   207b; 218b. c; 223a; 251a; 261a;  
   274a; 304a; 311e. f.; 397a  
*Roncofreddo* 294n  
*Rovigo* 12c; 309a

- Sabbioneta* 105a  
*Salerno* 205a  
 Samuel *המקובל* 271a  
 Samuel b. Abigdor 158d  
 Samuel b. Daniel 334a  
 Samuel b. Isaac ha-Rophe in Rome 7b  
 Samuel b. Jekutiel da Gubbio 98a; 452a  
 Samuel Maffole (?) 33k see: Samuel of פולא in Seruide  
 Samuel b. Maimon 359a  
 Samuel b. Meir 124a; 355a  
 Samuel b. Menahem 408a  
 Samuel b. Menahem 436b  
 Samuel b. Moses of Modena 456a  
 Samuel ha-Rophe of Gubbio 320a  
 Samuel b. Shalom 280b  
 Samuel ibn Shoham (Beryllo) b. David 302b  
 Samuel b. Solomon ha-Sofer 480a  
 Samuel of פולא in Seruide 33h. k. n. *San Giuliano* ? *אולליא* 16a  
*San Paolo* 113a  
*San Severino* 8a; 108c; 166a; 315a; 491a  
*Sciucca* 83a  
*Sermiano, Sermione* [Seruide]? *סירמיני* 122a; 321a; 467a  
*Seruide* (סירטוני) 33i. k. n.; 122a; 321a; 467a  
*Sezze* 106; 316  
 Shabbethai 148a  
 Shabbethai b. Abraham b. Moses Uri 311d  
 Shabbethai b. Isaac 79a  
 Shabbethai b. Jekutiel 178f  
 Shabbethai b. Matatia 14a. b.; 23a  
 Shabbethai b. Moses 480b  
 Shalom b. Samuel 478b  
 Shalom Jerushalmi b. Solomon b. Saadia 447a  
 Shealtiel Zarko 451n  
 Shemtob Teglio b. Abraham 436a  
 Shemtob b. Jacob Toscanelli 409c  
*Siena* 66a; 484a  
 Simson b. Judah 234  
*Sinigaglia* 236  
*Solmona* 75b; 178a. f  
 Solomon b. Abraham 278f  
 Solomon Rophe b. Benjamin Rophe 55  
 Solomon b. David Kohen 248b  
 Solomon b. Elia 254  
 Solomon b. Elia Capsali 362a  
 Solomon b. Immanuel de' Lancieri 270a  
 Solomon b. Isaac de Leon 450a  
 Solomon b. Jehiel 335A  
 Solomon b. Jehiel ha-Levi 112b. c  
 Solomon b. Joseph *ענול* (Rotundo)? 121a  
 Solomon b. Joshua 485a  
 Solomon Kohen-Porto 228  
 Solomon b. Matatia 489a  
 Solomon b. Moses b. Jekutiel 64a; 135a  
 Solomon b. Moses b. Joseph 176c  
 Solomon b. Nissim 38a  
 Solomon of Pisa 440a  
 Solomon Jedidia b. Israel of San Severino 204h.  
 Solomon [Jedidia] b. Matatia 455d  
 Solomon b. Samuel Lages 403a  
 Solomon b. Shabbethai 491a  
 Solomon Gedalja b. Shabbethai Gallico of San Severino 108a. b  
 Solomon b. Uziel  
*Soncino* 402b  
*Spello* (אשפיליו) 193h; 289a; 475c  
*Spezzano* 408b  
*Syracuse (Siracusa)* 447a. b.; 448a  
  
*Taranto* 149a  
*Teano* 379a  
*Termodi* 106a  
*Terracina* 468a  
*טערנינה* (*Pr. Venice*) 487c  
*Tivoli* 186b  
*Tolentino* 473a  
*Treviso* 344a  
*Trino* 204c. d  
*Turi* 150a  
  
 Uziel [b. Jacob] 12c; 458a  
  
*Venice* 283a  
*Viadana* 339b  
*Viesti* 154c  
*Visso* 55a  
*Viterbo* 472a  
*Vittoria* (?) 461a  
  
 Zakhariah b. Benjamin Finzi 276b  
 Zakhariah b. Menahem b. Elia de Rossi of Cesena 294n  
 Zemaḥ (Solomon b. Abraham) 22a



## LIST OF DATED MANUSCRIPTS

- 979: 446  
*cr. 11th cent.*: 390  
 1216: 457a  
 1230: 274a  
 1239: 139a  
 1247: 254a  
 1257: 234a  
 1260: 53a; 490a  
 1265: 174a; 349a  
 1266: 205a  
 1268: 104a; 176a  
 1269: 212a  
 1272: 472a  
 1273: 222a  
 1273/74: 157a  
 1277: 145a  
 1280: 192a  
 1282: 32a; 453a  
 1283: 14a  
 1283/84: 135a  
*bef. 1284*: 64a  
 1284: 176b; 218a; 468a  
 1285: 14b; 460a  
 1287: 176c; 293a  
 1288: 397a; 481a  
 1289: 35a; 143a; 192a  
*bef. 1290*: 124a  
 1290: 14c  
 1292: 64b. c; 351a; 397b; 474a  
 1293: 64d  
 1294: 218b  
*cr. 1295*: 259a  
 1297: 84a; 153a; 474b  
 1298: 86a  
 1299: 318a  
 1302: 369a  
*bef. 1303*: 366a  
 1303: 113a  
 1304: 264a; 358a  
 1305: 103a  
 1306 *or* 1311: 7n  
 1306: 397c  
 1307: 311a  
*bef. 1308*: 319a  
 1309: 89a; 207a; 289a; 474c  
 1310: 41a; 216a; 280a; 442a  
 1311: 30a; 104b; 461a  
 1312: 54a; 197a; 251a  
 1313: 256a  
 1315: 280b  
 1316: 293b; 371a; 442b; 481b  
 1316/17: 293c  
 1319: 311b
- 1320: 301a  
 1321: 207b  
 1322: 311c; 438a  
*cr. 1322/23*: 311h  
 1322/26: 311d  
*bef. 1323*: 280c  
 1323: 311e. f.  
*bef. 1324*: 156a  
 1324: 68a  
 1326: 189a; 311g  
 1328: 2a  
*bef. 1330*: 78  
 1330: 10a; 186a  
*after 1330*: 255a  
 1332: 4a; 186b  
 1336: 223a; 385a  
 1342: 85a; 97a; 424a; 475a  
 1345: 365a  
 1346: 475b  
 1347: 39a  
 1348: 475c  
 1350: 249a  
 1353: 275a  
 1355: 383a  
 1357: 169a; 190a; 239a  
 1358: 183a  
 1361: 59a  
 1363: 480b  
 1366: 175a; 206a  
 1367 (?) : 42a  
 1369: 224a; 368a  
 1370: 60a; 158a; 184  
 1371: 55a; 180a; 464a  
 1372: 61a; 107a  
 1373: 61b; 320a  
 1374: 200a; 327a; 356a  
 1377: 9a; 177a; 200b  
 1380: 181a; 440a  
 1381: 99a; 188a; 297a; 440b  
 1382: 29a; 482a  
 1383: 363a; 367a  
 1384: 36a  
 1384/85: 433c  
*bef. 1385*: 375a  
 1385: 427a  
 1386: 194a  
 1387: 12a; 158b  
 1389: 23a; 107b; 196a  
 1390: 80a; 193a. b. 340a  
 1391: 12b; 191a; 193c; 354a  
 1392: 3a; 262a  
 1393: 101a; 167a  
 1394: 101b; 161a; 298a; 439a; 470a

- 1395: 306a; 425a; 473a  
 1396: 193d; 288a; 466a; 489a  
 1397: 12c; 288b. c.; 291a; 406a  
 1398: 7a  
 1399: 29b; 79a; 287a; 455a  
 1399-1401: 208a  
 1400: 62a; 455b. 478a  
 1401: 158c; 172a; 193c; 455 c. d.  
 1401-02: 208b  
 1402: 208c; 386a  
 1403: 65a; 95a; 132a; 407a; 440c;  
 491a  
 1404: 125a; 208d; 245a; 375b; 455c;  
 478b  
 1405: 478c  
 bef. 1406: 137b  
 1406: 221a; 230a  
 1407: 49a  
 1408: 273a; 411a  
 1409: 187a; 260a  
 1410: 193f; 215a; 237a  
 1412: 19a; 300a; 338a  
 bef. 1413: 138a  
 1413: 107a; 357a; 377a; 454a  
 1414: 8a; 100a; 111a; 464b; 466b  
 1415: 100b; 111b; 193g; 298b; 300b;  
 469a  
 1416: 193b; 357b  
 1417: 133a  
 1418: 308a; 313a. b.  
 1419: 5a; 178a; 287b; 357c  
 bef. 1420: 26a  
 1420: 303a  
 1420 or 1422: 19b  
 bef. 1421: 281a  
 1421: 19c; 108a. 178b; 231a; 307a;  
 313c  
 1422: 108b; 178c. d.  
 1423: 332a  
 1424: 38a; 108c; 313d.  
 1425: 100c; 166a; 205A. a.; 388a;  
 426a; 485a  
 1426: 19d; 31a; 484a  
 1427: 151a; 185a; 315a; 462a  
 1428: 102a; 314a  
 1429: 81b; 90a; 131a; 314b  
 1430: 22a  
 1431: 2 note; 58a; 66a; 140a; 382a  
 1432: 22b; 252a; 298 note; 347a; 378a  
 1433: 106a; 140b; 471a  
 1434: 121a; 288d  
 bef. 1436: 121b; 483a  
 1436: 361a  
 1437: 454b  
 1438: 109a; 352a  
 1439: 11a; 83a; 164a; 266a  
 1440: 305c; 328a  
 1441: 27a; 115b; 295a  
 1442: 146a  
 1443: 56a; 109b  
 1444: 109c; 282a; 450a  
 1445: 150a; 178f  
 1446: 290a; 302a; 335a; 339a; 364a  
 1447: 434a; 476a  
 1448: 81b; 159a; 324a  
 1449: 266b; 335A. a. 432a  
 1450: 47a; 76a; 159b; 162a; 335b  
 1451: 50a; 70a  
 1452: 246a; 435a  
 1453: 46a; 162b; 344a  
 bef. 1454: 11a  
 1454: 25a; 128a; 154a; 214a; 266c  
 1455: 74 note; 155b; 246b; 391a  
 1455-56: 154c  
 1456: 329a. b; 451a  
 1457: 22b; 75a; 486a  
 1458: 34a; 285 note; 321a; 403a  
 1459: 128b; 456a  
 1460: 209a; 339b  
 1461: 144a; 229a  
 1462: 98a; 117a; (?) 118a; 201a; 398a;  
 434b  
 1463: 15c; 34b; 63a; 75b; 94a; 126a;  
 227a; 329c; 409a; 416a  
 1463/64: 118b.  
 1464: 5a; 129a  
 after 1464: 204t  
 1465: 165a; 248a; 276a; 323a; 415a  
 1466: 431a  
 1467: 302b; 374a; 463a  
 1467-68: 82a  
 1468: 204a. b.; 246c; 360 note; 409b;  
 417a  
 bef. 1469: 458a  
 1469: 33a; 91a; 114a; 148a; 241a  
 1470: 33. b. c.; 92a; 204c. d.; 402a;  
 452a  
 1471: 33ca; 246d; 270a  
 1472: 40a; 45a; 198a; 246c; 263a;  
 267a; 322a  
 1473: 33ea; 40a; 45a; 246c; 271a;  
 379a; 487a  
 1474: 6a; 33eb; 57a; 72a; 112a. b.;  
 122a; 171a; 285a; 294a; 296a; 387a;  
 415b  
 1475: 43a; 155a; 182a; 294b; 393a;  
 428a; 444a  
 bef. 1476: 488a  
 1476: 236a; 278a; 279a; 376a; 487b  
 1477: 57b; 115a; 120a; 126b; 204f;  
 299a; 309a; 333a  
 1478: 1a; 33f; 44a; 74b; 246f; 248b;  
 423a; 428b  
 1478-79: 402b

- 1479: 33g; 44b; 112b. c.; 228a  
 1480: 17a; 250a; 294c; 333b; 400a;  
 452b. c.; 465a  
 1481: 11b. c.; 33h; 204g. h.; 286  
 1482: 33i. k. l.; 119a; 204i. k; 235a;  
 246g; 380a; 452d  
 bef. 1483: 428i  
 1482/99: 448a  
 1483: 93a; 163a; 204m; 336a; 380c;  
 413a; 480a  
 1484: 15 note; 16a; 33m; 52a; 126c;  
 204 note; 219a, 449a; 452e  
 1485: 33ma; 204o; 213a; 322b;  
 447a. b.; 477a  
 1486: 33 note; 123a; 127n; 175a;  
 204p; 247a; 268a; 408a; 410a  
 1487: 70a; 204 note; 294d; 408b.
- bef. 1488: 405a  
 1488: 33o. p; 204q; 436b  
 1489: 33w; 204v; 242a; 278b  
 1490: 44c; 74c; 168a; 294c  
 1491: 44d; 175b; 204v; 346a  
 1492: 33q; 112d; 240a; 283a; 299  
 note; 334a; 370a; 422a; 445a  
 1493: 142a; 149a; 269a; 395a  
 1494: 33r; 44e; 272a; 278c; 459a  
 1495: 44f; 348a; 396a  
 1496: 21a; 33s; 204s  
 1497: 240b  
 1498: 225a.  
 1499: 88a; 334b; 359a; 400b; 487c  
 1500: 160  
 cr. 1500: 362a.



## THEMON JUDAEUS AND HIS WORK

By HARRY FRIEDENWALD

Several years ago I secured through Mr. E. P. Goldsmith of Old Bond Street, London, the volume which he described as follows:

“(THIMO JUDAEUS). — Quaestiones quator Librorum Meteorologicorum Aristotelis. (Pavia, Antonius de Carcano, ca. 1480) Fol. goth. 2 col. 102 leaves (including three blank leaves: 1, 6, and 86) Pigskin. (P. Duhem's copy)

Not in Hain, Copinger, Reichling, etc. The only copy hitherto recorded is that in the British Museum, acquired 1900, which is described in B. M. Cat. VII, p. 997 (=Proctor 7054A). It is there listed as anonymous under “*Quaestiones*” and in fact the author's name is not found anywhere in the book.

In our copy however the author's name “*Timon Judaeus*” is written by a XVth cent hand at the top of the first page, and that this intitulation is reliable is confirmed by the fact that in a Paris 1518 edition of the same text the statement is found that it was compiled “per doctissimum philosophie professorem Thimonem”.

The former owner of this copy, *Pierre Duhem*, gives a full account of Thimo's interesting doctrines in his “*Études sur Leonard de Vinci*” I.159–212, 345; II.330–367, without however accepting the attribution in his own copy; he is inclined to regard these “*Quaestiones*” as the work of Albert of Saxony. The authorship of Thimo the Jew has however since then been definitely established by A. Birkenmajer in *Philos. Jahrbuch* 1922 pp. 87 ff. See also *Ueberweg-Geyer* (*Grundriss* II. (1928) p. 602 and 784”.

A Ms. copy is described by Wolf<sup>1</sup> in the Vatican Library as follows: Rabbi Timon, scripsit quaestiones in Aristotelis libros Meteorologicos, ut & in libros de Generatione & Corruptione MS, in Biblioth. Vaticana fol.

<sup>1</sup> Jo. Christopher Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebraea*, (1715) Vol. 1, p. 1157, No. 2223.

Concerning Temo Judaeus, Temon or Timon le Juif, or Themo Judaeus, as he inscribed himself, we know that he came to Paris from Muenster in Westphalia. He became a Master of Arts under de Chivasso in Paris in 1349 and at assemblies of the Masters of the "English Nation"<sup>2</sup> gathered at the Church of St. Julien le Pauvre in 1353 and again in 1355, Themon was elected as their "procureur". The "procureur" was the head of his group, just as the "Rector" was president of the university as a whole. He was generally elected from among the young masters, inscribed his name and the date of his election on a special register and noted under oath all facts of importance, bestowal of degrees, etc., during his service.<sup>3</sup> (It was in 1349 that "two brothers" Themon and Nicolas de Munster "surnommés les fils du Juif" presented themselves for examination for the baccalaureate degree. Nicolas is not mentioned later. Themon had charge of certain schools of the "English Nation", and their maintenance; and appears to have advanced sums of money which were but slowly repaid. He retained this stewardship until he left the University in October 1361. He was succeeded by Albert of Saxe. In the preceding year Themon was chosen (with representatives of the other "Nations") as a delegate to Pope Innocent VI at Avignon.

Themon and his brother were converts; it is possible that their father was still a Jew.<sup>4</sup> The period at which the brothers appeared in Paris was one of outbreaks and massacre in Germany and this may have had a bearing upon their conversion.

Themon's work gives an account of the state of physics in the middle of the 14th century, at a time when the University took pride in its triumvirate of brilliant philosophers, Jean Buridan, Themon le Juif and Albert de Saxe. Duhem tells us that the treatise was studied by Leonardo da Vinci.

It appears that physicists used his works and plagiarized

<sup>2</sup> One of the four "nations" which divided the members of the university, each "nation" combining both masters and students.

<sup>3</sup> It is from these lists that his positions were discovered.

<sup>4</sup> Duhem, *Etudes sur Leonard de Vinci. Ceux qu'il a Lus et Ceux Qui L'Ont Lu*. 2 vols. Paris, 1906 and 1909. See Vol. I p. 164.

them freely. Duhem states that the name of Themon did not suffer least from this systematic and unjust oblivion!

In describing the relations of Leonardo to Themon, Duhem states it is especially in Themon's explanation of the rainbow, that he excels not only all the ancients and their Arabian commentators but also the great scholastics, such as Albertus Magnus, Roger Bacon and Vitello(?). For Themon's explanation of the primary rainbow is that held today. Leonardo followed him closely in this. Duhem regards Themon as the forerunner of Descartes.

It is likewise in the study of tides that it was Themon who first recognized the dual influences of the sun and the moon, a view not again revived until the 16th century. In this Leonardo likewise follows Themon.

There has been controversy as to the authorship of Themon's work. The claim has been made for Albert de Saxe. Duhem indeed was in doubt. Later writers, especially Birkenmajer,<sup>5</sup> have established Themon's authorship.

His importance, in the history of the University of Paris should, therefore, not suffer the earlier oblivion of which Duhem complains and to which he is condemned in the recent *Histoire des Universités* in which Duhem's work is referred to under Albert de Saxe and Themon's name is nowhere mentioned.

George Sarton has kindly permitted me to read in manuscript his interesting note on the work of Themon for Volume III of his *History of Science*.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Dr. Alexander Birkenmajer, "Vermischte Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Mittelalterlichen Philosophie", *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* XXXV, 1922, 87; Munster 1922.

<sup>6</sup> Since this paper is in type, Vol. III of Sarton has appeared, with numerous references to "Themon, son of the Jew".



## JUDAH AND THE TRANSJORDAN STATES FROM 734 TO 582 B. C. E.

By H. L. GINSBERG

By the Transjordan states we understand, in accordance with current usage, the kingdoms of Edom, Moab, and the children of Ammon. However, only the last named lay, properly speaking, across the Jordan from western Palestine; Moab being situated east of the Dead Sea rather than of the river Jordan, and Edom for the most part east, but also partly west, of Wādi-l-'Arabah, the southwest extension of the Jordan-Dead Sea depression down to the gulf of 'Aqabah.<sup>1</sup>

In the year 733 B. C. E. Tiglathpileser III, the king of Assyria, detached from Israel its territories east of the Jordan ('Gilead,' 2 Ki. 15:29)<sup>2</sup> among others. Either immediately or at some later time the children of Ammon, who already in the latter half of the ninth century had similarly turned, or tried to turn, the Aramean conquest of Gilead to account (Amos 1:13, cf. v. 3),<sup>3a</sup> were permitted by the Assyrians to annex the southernmost part of this slice, which constitutes the land of Gad (cf.

<sup>1</sup> The archeological datum that the Edomite line of fortresses for defense against attack from the west follows the eastern bank of Wādi-l-'Arabah does not warrant the inference of Glueck, *HUCA* 11 (1936): 141-157, that grazing rights in the waste land between that line and 'Mount Halak (modern Jebel Ḥalāq), which goeth up to Seir' (Jos. 11:17; 12:7) did not belong to Edomite shepherds, and that consequently a large number of texts which assume that they did are on that account alone, and in the teeth of weighty considerations to the contrary, to be dated to the post-exilic period (Glueck, *JAOS* 56 [1936]: 462-471). Cf. Waterman, *JBL* 56 (1937):253 ff.

<sup>2</sup> With Kittel, *Biblia Hebraica*,<sup>3</sup> the phrase *ואת ארנוב ואת חות יאיר* is probably to be transferred from the vicinity of *נלערים* in v. 25 to that of *ואת הנלער* in v. 29.

<sup>3a</sup> Of course v. 6 and, if Amosian, v. 9 likewise refer to land-grabs by smaller neighbors of Israel during the Aramean oppression. See for the wording and meaning of these verses further on, n. 47.

Jer. 49:1 ff.)<sup>3</sup>. The rest of Israelite Transjordan was annexed to Assyria. Perhaps in the same year 733, more probably in the preceding one, Judah lost Elath to the Edomites (2 Ki. 16:6),<sup>4</sup> which doubtless meant that her border receded at least to Mount Halak.<sup>5</sup> The rump kingdom of Israel (often called Ephraim in Isaiah and Hosea)<sup>6</sup> perished in 721 without having recovered a foothold in Transjordan; but the kingdom of Judah endured until 587, and inherited all of its sister's claims and aspirations.

At first, however, it was not even able to maintain its old possessions in Cisjordan. There is probably some basis of historical fact to the notice (2 Chr. 28:18) that the Philistines nibbled at the northwest corner of Ahaz's realm at the same time as the Edomites bit off a chunk from its southeast corner.<sup>7</sup> Hezekiah's reported action against the former (2 Ki. 18:8) may have had for its object the recovery of just those towns which

<sup>3</sup> The date and authorship of this oracle will be discussed further on.

<sup>4</sup> In the first half of this verse, by common consent, *Rezin* is to be deleted and *Edom* is to be substituted twice for *Aram*; cf. *Edomites* (qere) in the second half (see also n. 7). We shall encounter *Aram* miswritten for *Edom* several times again in the course of this study, and once *Amorite* miswritten for *Edomite*; all of which will surprise no one who is not totally ignorant of both biblical science and Hebreo-Aramaic paleography.

<sup>5</sup> See above, n. 1. Perhaps the Edomites actually seized most of the eastern Negeb; cf. below n. 11b.

<sup>6</sup> See Alt, *Neue kirchliche zeitschrift* 1919: 554; *Festschrift Otto Procksch* (1934): 8 n. 3.

<sup>7</sup> Since the Philistines had helped Rezin of Aram to force an anti-Assyrian king, Pekah, upon Israel (Isa. 9:11) — happily Duhm's successors have not insisted that the (poetical) review Isa. 9:7–20 is a preview! — it would be surprising if they did not subsequently aid Rezin and Pekah in their attempt to seat the anti-Assyrian 'son of Tabeel' upon the throne of Judah (Isa. 7:5–6). Isa. 7 — which I shall analyze elsewhere — is not history but legend; but neither is it made of whole cloth, and that the purpose of the Syro-Ephraimite War was to establish a 'friendly' government in Jerusalem like the one that had been established in Samaria is obviously a correct historical reminiscence. When, therefore, 'Mitinti of Ashkelon violated the oath sworn to' Tiglath-pileser (Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Babylonia and Assyria* I: para. 779), he not improbably attacked Ahaz. (Cf. most recently Thiele, *JNES* 3 [1944]: 171). With the Judahites already hopelessly outnumbered by the Arameans, Israelites, and Philistines, no wonder the king of Edom was able to annex Elath (see above n. 4). [Isa. 7 is analyzed in *J. N. Epstein Vol.*, 29–32.]

had been lost by Ahaz; that is, *if* Ahaz had not recovered them himself,<sup>8</sup> and *if* the campaign, or campaigns, in question took place early in Hezekiah's reign. Otherwise the purpose is more likely to have been one of the following two: either to assist the war party in Ekron, whose king Padi we know was loyal to Assyria and had to be taken in custody to Jerusalem in order to enable his country to fight on Hezekiah's side,<sup>9</sup> or alternatively to reconquer the much more extensive Judahite territory which was carved up among the Philistine principalities by Sennacherib after the collapse of Hezekiah's rebellion in 701.<sup>10</sup>

The partition of 701 is of special interest to us. Elliger<sup>11</sup> has made it probable that the territory lost by Judah lay south of a line running eastward from a point not far north of Moresheth-gath (Tell ej-Judeideh); and has plausibly suggested that altho Micah does not include localities east of the watershed in his lament (Micah 1:8 ff.)<sup>11a</sup> that is only because none are visible from his point of vantage upon the site of his native Moresheth-gath, and does not warrant the conclusion that the dividing line did not cut all the way across the breadth of Judah. But on the other hand it is not likely that the Philistines either would or could control the southeast corner of Judah, and the latter will have fallen into the hands of the Edomites.<sup>11b</sup> Now the famous stamped jar-handles show that Judah regained Hebron and Ziph<sup>12</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Isa. 14:28 ff. — if Isaian, and if v. 28 is in order.

<sup>9</sup> Luckenbill, op. cit. (in n. 7) II, paras. 240, 311.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid. paras. 240, 312. — Eissfeldt, *Palästina-jahrbuch* 27 (1931): 58–66, makes quite a respectable case for taking Ezek. 16:27 as a reference to this event.

<sup>11</sup> *ZDPV* 57 (1934): 81–152.

<sup>11a</sup> Another balance-sheet which Sellin was still blithely interpreting as a budget in *Das Zwölfprophetenbuch* (= *Kommentar zum Alten Testament XII*),<sup>2</sup> p. 306, as recently as 1929. (Cf. above n. 7 on Isa. 9:7–20.)

<sup>11b</sup> If it had not already done so in 734; see above n. 5.

<sup>12</sup> That is, no doubt, the more northern Ziph (Jos. 15:55), not the one on the border of Edom (ibid. v. 24). The latter would seem to be precluded by a number of considerations: e. g. (a) the large number of Ziph stamps found on northern sites, (b) the absence of the names of more important intervening towns from the stamps, (c) the exposed position of the southern Ziph right near the ascent of Akrabbim (Jos. 15:3; Jud. 1:36, where read by common consent *the Edomite for the Amorite*), which renders it unsuitable for a center



of any sort. Now, only four miles southwest of the northern Ziph lies Juttah (יִטָּחָה, Jos. 15:55; 21:16, modern Yaṭṭa), whose name I substitute for that of non-existent Jotbah (יִטְבָּה) in 2 Ki. 21:19 with as little hesitation as that of Dumah (דּוּמָה, Jos. 15:52, modern ed-Dōmeh) for that of non-existent Rumah (רומָה) in 2 Ki. 23:36. (The Septuagint wrongly reads *Ρουμα* in Jos. 15:52 too.) With the view herein adopted, that the districts in question were only restored to Judah in the reign of Manasseh, agrees the age of Amon, the son of Manasseh and Meshullemeth of Juttah, at the time of his father's death: 22 years (2 Ki. 21:19). That was in 642, so that Amon was born in 664. It follows from this that Manasseh must have recovered Juttah *not later than 665*, and from the next footnote that he did so *nōt earlier than 667*.

I am of course aware that other writers identify 'Jotbah' with modern Jefāt and 'Rumah' with modern Khirbet Rūmeh, both in Lower Galilee. But precisely because these sites are in Galilee, I should probably reject these identifications even if they did not involve any textual emendations. And they actually necessitate, as their advocates have not hitherto realized, even more far-reaching ones than mine. For what Hebrew form is, on the one hand, the original of Tiglathpileser's [*Ia-*] *at-bi-te* (see Luckenbill, *op. cit.* I, para. 779; which, however, does not take into account the doubtless correct restoration of Forrer, *Die provinzeinteilung des assyrischen reiches* [1921]: 61, cited by Maisler, *BJPES* I 1 [1933]: 2-3 n. 11, to which my attention has been kindly called by my colleague Prof. Shalom Spiegel) and, on the other, the ancestor of talmudic יטבת and יירפת, of Josephus's Ἰωταπαρα, and of modern Arabic *Jefāt*? Obviously not יטבה but יטבת (or יטבתה, which is also the name of a locality in the district of the Gulf of 'Aqabah, Num. 33:33 f.; Deut. 10:7). By the same token, the town which Tiglathpileser knew as *Aruma* (Luckenbill, *ibid.*), and which appears as ארומָה in the editions of TB 'Erubin 51 b (tho as רומָה in the Munich ms. and Tosefta *ibid.* 3(4):17, רומָה in TP *ibid.* IV end, 22a, and *Ρουμα* in Josephus, *Wars* III 7:21), was indubitably called ארומָה in biblical times (cf. its namesake in Jud. 9:41).

As between very slight emendations that make sense and more profound alterations that don't, there can be but one choice. All of the queen mothers of Judah were natives of Judah — the Gibeah of 2 Chr. 13:2 is of course that of Jos. 15:57; 1 Chr. 2:49 — or of Jerusalem, with the exception of Naamah (1 Ki. 14:21) and Athaliah (2 Ki. 8:26); and these were princesses. Athaliah was a daughter of King Omri of Israel (2 Ki. 8:26; cf. v. 18; see Begrich, *ZAW* 53 [1935]: 78-79), and Naamah the Ammonitess was doubtless a daughter of Shobi ben Nahash of Rabbah of the children of Ammon (2 Sam. 17:27); whose royal father had been, as he himself was, a friend of David (see 2 Sam. 10:1-2), and whom David evidently recognized as vassal king, or 'ethnarch,' of the Ammonites after defeating his brother Hanun ben Nahash (2 Sam. 10-12). Cf. further 2 Sam. 3:3b; 1 Ki. 3:1; 16:31. [If, as I consider very improbable, David left no vestige of a native kingship in the Ammonite country, then so much the better; for in that case Naamah was Solomon's direct subject, and so on a par with Zibiah of Beer-sheba (2 Ki. 12:2), for

not later than the reign of Manasseh,<sup>13</sup> but — whatever the purpose of the stamps may have been — it is cause for reflection that no name of a more southern locality figures among them.<sup>14</sup> It would seem that Manasseh was less successful in recovering Edomite-held land than in regaining Philistine-held districts, and that the redemption of the former had to await the rise of Judah's great irredentist king, Josiah (639–609).

That Josiah, taking advantage of the rapid decline of Assyrian power in the second half of his reign, made a bid to restore the ancient borders of the Davidic kingdom is admitted by an increasingly large number of writers. But opinions differ as to the extent of his successes and the extent of the traces they have

example.] A woman who was both a commoner and the subject of another king could doubtless become the concubine of a king of Judah, but not his wife. To marry a woman of Jotapata would have meant for Manasseh both degrading himself from a vassal to a subject of Asshurbanapal and arousing in the latter suspicions that he was plotting to seize territories which were under the direct rule of the Assyrian king; than which few things could have been farther from Manasseh's mind. Arumah too was still outside the realm of Josiah at the time of his nuptials with Zebudah of Dumah (2 Ki. 23:36).

<sup>13</sup> Most probably the occasion was Asshurbanapal's Egyptian campaign of 667 B. C. E., on which his 22 Syro-Palestinian and Cypriote vassals, among them Manasseh of Judah joined him with gifts and armies; see Luckenbill, op. cit. II, para. 876. Manasseh evidently succeeded in convincing his liege that it would be safe as well as just to transfer some of the indisputably Jewish territory to such a sincere Assyrophile as himself; and from Asshurbanapal's point of view it was not a bad idea, now that the Assyrian dominions extended into Egypt, to weaken the Philistines, thru whose land the road to Egypt passed.

<sup>14</sup> *Mmšt* used to be identified by Albright with the Mopsis or Mampsis of Greek writers, a town in the Negeb which was in all probability identical with modern Kurnub. But in *AASOR* 21–22 (1943): 75 he renounced this combination, observing that (1) each of the other three cities named on the stamps tends to be most heavily represented among stamps discovered in its own neighborhood and (2) *Mmšt* is most heavily represented in the north (Gezer, Jerusalem, Gibeah of Benjamin, Tell en-Naşbeh). — In *JBL* 65 (1946): p. iv I have identified *Mmšt* linguistically as \**mamšatt* < \**mamšalt* = *memšālā* 'government' and factually with the city-state of Jerusalem. Whoever knows Alt's *Die staatenbildung der Israeliten in Palästina* knows that in pre-exilic times there was a good constitutional reason for the frequent formal coordination of Judah and Jerusalem (Isa. 1:1; 2:1; 3:1, 8; etc.). [See now *BASOR* 109 (Feb. 1948):20–23.]

left in the Scriptures, and it is obvious that a writer's estimate of the former will be largely determined by his views on the latter. Now that archeology has furnished the datum that the history of Megiddo II ends with a partial destruction ca. 600,<sup>15</sup> there may still be serious scholars who question the historicity of the Jewish king's 'desecration of Bethel ([2 Ki.] 23:15) and the shrines of Samaria (23:19 f.),' but they will surely not give as their reason that 'Josiah had no jurisdiction' over those localities.<sup>16</sup> For if the destroyers of Megiddo II were not Egyptians taking action against Jews in 609 (see 2 Ki. 23:29),<sup>17</sup> they were Jews trying to oust Egyptians or — if the destruction took place before 609 — Assyrians.<sup>18</sup> The latter, however, probably decided,

<sup>15</sup> Lamon and Shipton, *Megiddo I*, 1939, p. 87. Cf. Alt, *ZAW* 60 (1944): 85 n. 1.

<sup>16</sup> So still Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, 1941, p. 402.

<sup>17</sup> For a quarter of a century now, it has been a commonplace that Necho II of Egypt was on his way not to attack but to succor the king of Assyria; see Gadd, *The fall of Nineveh: The newly discovered Babylonian chronicle, No. 21,901 in the British Museum*, 1923, p. 7 n. 1 and pp. 15 f. As pointed out by Procksch, *Zahn-Festgabe*, 1928, p. 51, Megiddo commands the passes south of the Carmel thru which Necho II, like Thutmose III almost a millennium earlier, made his way from the Plain of Sharon to the Valley of Esdraelon. But obviously it was no threat to him unless it was occupied — or he feared it might be occupied — by troops which were neither Egyptian nor allied (viz. Assyrian), that is to say by Jewish troops.

<sup>18</sup> That an Egyptian garrison made a stand at Megiddo in 605 against the forces of Nebuchadrezzar is rather improbable; since the Pharaoh's troops, after their smashing defeat in Syria (perhaps far to the southwest of the traditional location at Carchemish on the Middle Euphrates — see Rudolph *ZAW* 60 [1944]: 96 and previous literature cited *ibid.* n. 1), must have been thoroly demoralized by the time the Chaldeans had advanced into Palestine. Equally remote is the possibility that the destruction of Megiddo II took place between 605 and 598 in connection with 2 Ki. 24:1 ff.: for one thing it involves the not very plausible assumption that first Necho (after the experience of 609 with Josiah!) and then Nebuchadrezzar had suffered Jehoikim to retain, albeit as a vassal, what Josiah had acquired at Assyria's expense [so Rost, *Israel bei den propheten* (= *Beiträge zur wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament*, vierte folge, heft 19 [1937]), p. 61 n. 1; where there is a reference to Chr. u. W. 5 (1929): 69 ff., which I am unable to consult]. — Apart from general considerations one might, with Alt, *Festschrift Otto Procksch* (1934): 15 n. 1, adduce against that hypothesis the Septuagint text of 2 Ki. 24:2; 2 Chr. 36:5, according to which Samaria participated in the punitive



somewhere along the line, to make a virtue of necessity and let Josiah advance unhindered, perhaps as their nominal vassal; much as they had already done (ca. 655) with Psammetichus I of Egypt, and as some empires are doing today with their Nehrus, Jinnahs, and Soekarnos.<sup>19</sup>

According to Alt<sup>20</sup> further traces, nay records, of Josiah's expansion exist in the shape of the town-lists of the book of Joshua; those in Jos. 15:21 ff.; 18:21 ff.; 19:2-7, 41-46 representing Josiah's administrative divisions in the south, those embedded in 19:10-39 his holdings in the north, and those in 13:15 ff. (and Num. 32:3, 34-38) his territory in Transjordan. But welcome as any data on the last named subject in particular would be in the present context, I am unable to accept a Josian dating for any of these lists. The place to look in for reflexes of Josiah's exploits is not in a book like Joshua, which was obviously completed, except for odd glosses, centuries before Josiah was born,<sup>21</sup> but the books of Nahum and Jeremiah and the post-

expedition of 600-598. But the mention of Samaria in the LXX is suspect on both formal and material grounds; in the LXX of 2 Ki. 24:2, upon which that of 2 Chr. 36:5 is dependent, we have 'and from Samaria' where the coordinate expressions would lead one to expect 'and the bands of Samaria' if Samaria were mentioned at all; and in the context, an interpolation of the name of 'the adversaries' par excellence 'of Judah and Benjamin' (Ezr. 4:1) is infinitely easier to account for than its elimination.

<sup>19</sup> Even at the beginning of Josiah's reign, before pressure of Medes and Chaldeans in her rear had compelled her to give up all of the West, Assyria had probably made some concessions to him in order to woo him away from Egypt, which at that stage was naturally anti-Assyrian and encouraged the Jewish king's irredentism. This three-cornered game is doubtless reflected in Jer. 2:16, 18, 36-37.

<sup>20</sup> *Palästina-jahrbuch* 21 (1925): 100-117; *ZAW* 45 (1927): 59-81; *apud* Procksch, *Zahn-Festgabe* (1928): 47 f.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. *JBL* 67 (1948): v. — That there are pre-anti-bamot strata in 'deuteronomistic' passages in the Former Prophets is only one of the theses of Yehezqël Kaufmann, *Toledot ha-emunah hay-Yisreelit*, which Bible scholarship will have to accept eventually, the sooner the better. [Already it is beginning to adopt his distinction between the Tetrateuch (Genesis-Numbers) and Deuteronomy, (op. cit. I-a (1937): 201 ff., while giving the credit to Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche studien* (1943). Owing to the fact that Kaufmann's book is for the present unfortunately available only in Hebrew, neither Noth

Isaian portions of Isaiah 1–39. (Zephaniah prophesied too early in Josiah's reign to reflect his undertakings and achievements. Those phrases in Zeph 2:7, 9 which hold out promises of Jewish expansion in Philistia and Transjordan are glosses, and are at variance with the basic text; whose import is precisely that the territories in question are to remain forever without *any* permanent habitations: see Sellin ad loc.)

In Nah. 2:3, *Jacob* and *Israel* apparently mean *Ephraim* and *Judah* respectively; so that the patriot poet Nahum anticipates — more probably already looks back upon at least a partial realization of — the very thing which his patriot king Josiah set out to achieve: the restoration of Greater Israel.<sup>22</sup>

As for Jeremiah, it is now happily recognized<sup>23</sup> that Jer. 3:6–13 (14–15) is indeed by Jeremiah and indeed, as v. 6 states, from the reign of Josiah; and that chs. 30–33:13, tho secondarily supplemented and complemented,<sup>24</sup> are primarily Jeremian. What therefore can be more obvious than that there must be some connection between passages like 3:6 ff. and 31:4–6 on the one hand and Josiah's achievements, or at least ambitions, on the other? It is hard to say to what extent these passages were inspired by Josiah's work and to what extent they inspired it; on the other hand, it is pretty clear that the pilgrimage we read about in Jer. 41:5 of people from the province of Samaria to Jerusalem, which took place after the house of David had lost both the one and the other, is a *sequel* to Josiah's conquests and

nor those who follow him were aware of its priority in this matter; else they would surely also have bowed, for example, to its demonstration that P, like the other components of Genesis-Numbers, is older than Deuteronomy.]

<sup>22</sup> Procksch, op. cit. 43 n. 2. — That Nah. 1:9b, 12; 2:1b; 3:18 f. point to a date of composition *shortly after* the fall of Nineveh (612 B. C. E.) is argued not unreasonably by Sellin, op. cit. (see above, n. 11a) 354 f.

<sup>23</sup> Spiegel, *JBL* 61 (1942): iv; Rudolph, *ZAW* 60 (1944): 87. — I cite Rudolph's article 'Zum Jeremiabuch,' *ZAW* 60: 85–106, for the reason that his commentary on Jeremiah, which came out in 1947 (in Eissfeldt's *Handbuch zum Alten Testament*), was unfortunately inaccessible in the United States. If therefore some of the views advanced, or observations made, in this paper have been anticipated in Rudolph's book, I trust everybody will understand why I have omitted to give him credit.

<sup>24</sup> 'Später ergänzt und aufgefüllt,' Rudolph, op. cit. p. 91.

reforms in central Palestine.<sup>25</sup> A fourth passage in Jeremiah reflects, tho hitherto the fact does not seem to have been realized, Josiah's ambitions, if not actual conquests, still farther afield: in Transjordan.

The passage in question is Jer. 49:1 ff.<sup>26</sup> It has already been cited in the second paragraph of this paper as evidence for the Ammonites' occupation of the ancient territory of Gad, but it is equally good evidence for some lively irredentist feeling on that score in Judah. Its Jeremian authorship ought never to have been questioned. The very structure of 49:1, which in the Bible is peculiar to Jeremiah,<sup>27</sup> ought to have given the doubters pause, and how well the content fits into the historical situation will be seen in a moment. It is therefore gratifying to find that Rudolph<sup>28</sup> accepts the oracle as genuine except for vv. 2b (the case against which is hardly decisive) and 6. But when was it uttered? If the content were the only thing we had to go by, the balance of probability would surely be in favor of the eve, or the course, of an attempt by Josiah to recover Israelite Transjordan. Rudolph,<sup>29</sup> however, applying the date of 46:1 f. to all of 46-49:33, believes that the advance of the Chaldeans in the year 605 accounts sufficiently for Jeremiah's expectation that the nations threatened in the oracles in question were about to be punished for their several sins. True, just in the case of the verses which follow immediately after 46:1 f. he adds the qualification that they were secondarily included among the oracles of 605 because that was when they were fulfilled, but

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Procksch, op. cit. p. 44.

<sup>26</sup> Frank North's drastic paring of the text in *JBL* 65 (1946): 37 ff. does not affect the following argumentation. Thus if, for metrical reasons, 'Gad' were omitted from v. 1 as a gloss, (in which case, by the way, *yāraš* would have to be emended to *yāšō* 'has inherited him' [namely Israel]), it would still be a correct gloss. However, it is much better to meet the metrical difficulty by taking *maddū* out of the line as an anacrusis.

<sup>27</sup> Tho of course it didn't originate with him; see *BASOR*, Supplementary Studies 2-3 (1946): 35, on the Ugaritic passage KRT A ll. 37b-43, and cf. Isa. 50:2.

<sup>28</sup> Op. cit. p. 98, l. 9 from below; p. 99, ll. 14-12 from below.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid. p. 100.



that they had actually been spoken in 609;<sup>30</sup> and that makes 46:1 f. a less insuperable obstacle than they might otherwise have been to an earlier dating of other oracles in this section. But in the case of the anti-Ammonite oracle an earlier dating is not absolutely necessary; for 49:1 ff. makes sense in 605 too, if we assume that in spite of Josiah's efforts the land of Gad had either remained Ammonite or had become Ammonite again by 605. The latter is the more probable assumption, since the Transjordan states' policy of aiding their overlord Nebuchadrezzar rather than their fellow-vassal Jehoiakim in ca. 600-598 (2 Ki. 24:2; cf. Jer. 35:11)<sup>31</sup> would be hard to understand unless Josiah had in fact seized some of their territories; in which case it would be only natural.<sup>32</sup> For then the children of Ammon, even if they had recovered the land of Gad upon Josiah's death (as they no doubt had), would still have had to fear ca. 600 that a Jehoiakim who recovered his independence from Nebuchadrezzar would proceed to attempt to recover the lands recently ruled by his father. If, therefore, Jer. 49:1 ff. does not reflect Judah's hopes for an early liberation of Gad some time before 609, it does reflect Judah's grief and indignation at the children of Ammon's reconquest of it in 609 or later, and hence indirectly Josiah's previous conquest of it.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>30</sup> Ibid. p. 96.

<sup>31</sup> These of course are two more passages in which *Edom* must be substituted for *Aram*. There was no Aram in existence in the reign of Jehoiakim, while Edom is just the nation that is always named along with Moab and the children of Ammon. That Edom is the only one of the three to be named in Jer. 35:11 is due either to chance or to geography: to penetrate into Judah proper was less easy for Ammonites and Moabites than for Edomites.

<sup>32</sup> So already Alt *apud* Procksch op. cit. p. 45 — What aggression Josiah may have committed against Moab and Edom will be considered below.

<sup>33</sup> That the population of this district remained largely Israelite thruout the Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, and Greek periods, and that the prominence of the Jewish family of the Tobiads there during the last two of these periods is somehow connected with this circumstance, is pointed out by Maisler, *Tarbiz* 12 (1941): 109 ff. One might add that: (1) The brief episode of Josiah's reconquest very likely infused new vigor into the Israelite religion of this district as into that of central Palestine. (2) The factual basis for the abusive epithet of 'Ammonite slave' which Nehemiah bestows upon the leading Tobiad of his day (Neh. 2:19) may have been stumbled upon, unbe-

In Isaiah 1-39, finally, the passages which concern us are Isa. 8:23 and 9:1-6. Since the former is notoriously one of biblical exegesis's most disheartening children of sorrow, we shall first take up the latter. The basic observation to be made here is that only the concluding verse, 6, is a glimpse of the future. Verses 1-5, it can not be stressed too strongly, are NOT prediction. They are *narrative*. They *recount* a wondrous deliverance which — again the prevalent preconception must be firmly contradicted — God HATH wrought. The poem is NOT addressed to the people, nor yet (as some fondly delude themselves into thinking) to a prophet's ('Isaiah's') disciples. It is addressed to God (no amount of hair-splitting can change that, see vv. 2-3). In other words, it is a *psalm of national thanksgiving*, a *Te Deum*; or, if you will, a prophetic imitation of one. So, it is true, are the songs in ch. 12 and in 26:1 ff., which are nevertheless *zukunftsmusik*, but then each of those is prefaced by a rubric to the effect that it *is* 'music of the future.' Diehards, to be sure, may still point to 25:1 ff., which is not prefaced by such a rubric and nevertheless doubtless speaks of future glory. But then, 25:1 ff.

known to himself, by Avigad, *PEQ* July-October 1946: 125-132. There Avigad points out that the correct reading of a previously misread seal acquired at 'Ammân (ancient Rabbath-ammon) is 'lyh 'mt hnn'l ' 'lyh maid-servant of Hananel,' and also reveals the existence of another, unpublished seal, likewise from Transjordan, with the identical formula 'X maid-servant of Y.' He surmises that the exact meaning of 'mt in these seals is 'slave-wife,' the status of the women in question being more or less analogous to that of the woman in Exod 21:7-11. It would therefore seem that whereas the institution of slave-wife had long been rare or obsolete in Israel by the time of Nehemiah, it was pretty common in the land of the Ammonites (the seal of 'lyh may be contemporary with Nehemiah or earlier), and Nehemiah may have chosen to assume (rightly or wrongly) that Tobiah had one or more slave-wives in his pedigree. (He naturally wouldn't be deterred from name-calling by the technicality that the children of such unions were freeborn.) (However, Albright [letter of Nov. 13, 1947] prefers to interpret the legends of the 'mt seals on the analogy of those of the 'bd seals to mean 'X high official of (King) Y.' He points out that the Ammonites were close neighbors of the Arabs and the Arab tribes of that age were fond of having queens over them, 'so we may safely suppose that they also had female sheikhs,' also that *ardat* 'maid-servant of' similarly occurs as an occasional variant of *arad* 'servant of' on Accadian seals.)

is immediately preceded by a prediction of future glory (24:23); whereas 9:1-6 is, on the contrary, preceded by 8:23, which is a difficult verse in all conscience but whose most probable import is that an occasion for singing 9:1-6 HAS materialized. For it reads (the awkwardness of the translation being but a reflex of the slipshod glossatory style of the — probably corrupt — original) as follows: 'Indeed, it is not darkened for the distressed one now (i. e. any longer). The first one brought ignominy to the land of Zebulon and the land of Naphthali, but the last one has brought glory to the way of the sea, the other side of the Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles.'<sup>34</sup> This, coming between 8:21-22 and 9:1-6, is to be paraphrased thus: 'The first parts of Palestine to be covered by the (Assyrian) darkness of 8:22 and 9:1 were (in 734) the lands of Zebulon and Naphthali. The last to be cleared of it are what had become (in the years 734-3) the Assyrian provinces of Way of the Sea (=Assyr. Du'ru, for the city of Dor), Transjordan,<sup>35</sup> and Galilee of the Gentiles (=Assyr. Magidū, for the city of Megiddo).' Whether 'the first' and 'the last' are the respective Israelite or the respective Assyrian monarchs concerned, or anything else, it is hard to say; but the essence is that our verse regards as imminent, if it does not already presuppose in substance, the liberation of the uttermost ends of the ancient kingdom of Israel — thru the instrumentality, we may safely add in the light of 9:5-6, of a Davidic prince.

That prince, of course, was Josiah. The identification has already been contemplated by Mowinckel<sup>36</sup> and (at least for 8:23 divorced from 9:1-6) by Procksch.<sup>37</sup> If Mowinckel left open the choice between Josiah and some other seventh century descendant of David, while Procksch, when he next had occasion to discuss the passage,<sup>38</sup> did not even mention the possibility of its

<sup>34</sup> For the rendering of the second sentence cf. Procksch, op. cit. 47; *Jesaja* 1-39 (= *Kommentar zum Alten Testament IX*), 1930, p. 142 below.

<sup>35</sup> Its Assyrian name is not known; see Alt, *ZDPV* 52 (1939): 220 ff. on the Assyrian provinces in Palestine and their names.

<sup>36</sup> *Jesajadisiplene* (1936): 117 n. 4.

<sup>37</sup> *Zahn-Festgabe* (1928): 47.

<sup>38</sup> *Jesaja* 1-39 (1930): 143 f.



post-Isaian authorship but took the view that it embodied Isaiah's expectation of a messiah not necessarily identical with any person already born, that was because neither of those scholars had made the basic observation which, tho it will some day be banal, at present stands in such surprising need of the emphasis it has received, and now receives again, in this paper: Isa. 9:1-6 is NOT a prophecy of SALVATION TO COME (except for the glance into the future in the concluding verse of the poem)<sup>39</sup> BUT a psalm of thanksgiving for SALVATION EXPERIENCED,<sup>39a</sup> while 8:23 at least may be a glossatory note of triumphs which at the very least seem to be in process of realization. Had they realized this, both Mowinckel and Procksch would inevitably have identified the savior in question with Josiah. For neither of them was under any illusion about any deliverance which might have been the occasion for such a psalm of thanksgiving as 9:1-6 — let alone a liberation of nearly the whole of Palestine such as 8:23 seems to hint at — having been experienced in the reign of Hezekiah,<sup>40</sup> or in any subsequent

<sup>39</sup> With which cf. 2 Sam. 22:51//Ps. 18:51, at the end of a royal psalm of thanksgiving (for whose Davidic date and probable Davidic authorship see Kaufman, op. cit. [above, n. 21] II, 204, 503). — In *whāyṭā* (Isa. 9:4) the *w* is either purely conjunctive (not consecutive) or erroneously added by a scribe (as at the beginning of so many other cola in poetry; see Bergsträsser, *Hebräische grammatik* II, p. 43 below the line).

<sup>39a</sup> Bergsträsser, *Hebr. gramm.* II h, p. 29, drastically reduces the number of instances of the prophetic perfect. I heartily agree with him, only adding Isa. 9:1-6 (which Bergsträsser retains) to the passages previously included under this head in which 'es ist in wirklichkeit vergangenheit gemeint' — as it must be in a *Te Deum*.

<sup>40</sup> Jerusalem itself, to be sure, was not captured in 701; and post-Isaian legend (2 Ki 18:17 — 19:37//Isa. 36-37) like modern pilpul has turned this escape into a brilliant victory for Judah. But it was nothing but *solatio luctus exigua ingentis* to Isaiah (Isa. 1:7-9, which — *pace* Skinner and Kaufmann — can not date from 734; vv. 7-8 being compatible only with the situation after the debacle of 701) or to his hysterically weeping fellow-Jerusalemmites (Isa. 22:1-5a, 8b-14; for the sense of which — here too only the last clause refers to the future — see for the present *JBL* 66 [1947]: iv). Cf. also Kaufmann's plausible suggestion, op. cit. (above n. 21) II, pp. 663-4 n. 39, that Ps. 89:39 ff. may reflect the mood of Hezekiah after the calamity of 701 (vv. 1-38 being more appropriate for the reign of Solomon); to which I would add that Ps. 89:51-52 reminds me of Micah 4:14b, which is certainly a figure of speech

one except Josiah's.<sup>41-42</sup> The best commentary on Isa. 9:2-4 (in v. 2, of course, read הנילח for לא הנוי) is Nah. 2:1; for whose date see above, n. 22.

for the humiliation of Hezekiah. — As for the hypothesis that 2 Ki. 18:17-19:37 refers to an unrecorded second campaign of Sennacherib in Judah between 689 (the year in which Tirhakah actually became king of Ethiopia — cf. 2 Ki. 19:9a) and 687 (the latest possible date for Hezekiah's death), it still has a powerful protagonist in Albright (most recently *BASOR* 100 [December 1945]: 22 n. 28); but it assumes too many things which there are reasons for doubting (that there was a second campaign, that Hezekiah was still alive in 689-7, that Isaiah — who according to Albright's own chronology [ibid. p. 21, 1.6: death of Uzziah, cf. Isa. 6:1] was already a prophet in 742 — was still alive in 689-7), and there is not the slightest doubt but the editor of 1 Ki. 18 — like the editor of Isa. 36 — was of the opinion that the date of 2 Ki. 18:17 ff. was the same as that of vv. 13 ff. (moreover 20:1, 6 certainly place the deliverance of Jerusalem fifteen years before Hezekiah's death, and that can't possibly be later than 701; cf. 18:2, 13). Besides, supposing there *was* a second campaign of Sennacherib in Judah and that it *did* end in failure, the failure can not have been bad enough to account for Isa. 8:23-9:6, even making the most generous allowance for patriotic exuberance, once it is realized that 8:23-9:6 are NOT predictions (except for the last verse, as explained). For otherwise Manasseh, who must have succeeded Hezekiah almost immediately afterwards, would hardly have been known to Esarhaddon and Assurbanapal exclusively as a loyal vassal (see Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia* II, paras. 690, 876; cf. above, n. 13) and to the Bible as a sinner and an Assyrianizer (the story of his repentance, 2 Chr. 33:12 f., can not cancel the evidence of the older books, e. g., 2 Ki. 21 ff.; 24:3 f.; Jer. 15:4, and anyway it still leaves Manasseh a sinner and Assyrianizer just in the early years of his reign, after Judah's supposed victory over Assyria). Furthermore, Hezekiah in 689 was at least fifty years old and had previously known little besides defeat and humiliation. Let who will believe that Isa. 9:5-6 refers to a victor of such years and such antecedents. (See also the next note.) — And as regards Kaufmann's whimsical idea (op. cit. III, p. 214) that the distressful darkness of the Assyrian conquest of Transjordan and northern Palestine in 734-3 (8:21-23, v. 23 being understood to refer to Tiglathpileser's two campaigns, of 734 and 733 respectively) is offset by the joyous light of the extinction of the hereditary foe Aram in 732 (9:1-4!), I can't believe that he will tolerate indefinitely the self-imposed intellectual straitjacket of 'levels' which, by preventing him from dating anything within chs. 7-12 outside the reign of Ahaz, drives him to such desperate expedients. I shall animadvert upon some even more desperate ones in another paper.

<sup>41</sup> There is one small stylistic point which I should not even have mentioned were it all we had to go by, but which has better than an even chance of being significant in view of the historical reasons I have given for identifying the

Davidid hero of Isa. 9:5–6 with Josiah; namely, that Isa. 9:5aα is remarkably reminiscent of 1 Ki. 13:2ba: 'Behold a son shall be born to the house of David, Josiah shall be his name, etc.' The reader may compare the two expressions and their respective contexts with each other, think the matter over in the light of all the foregoing, and draw his own conclusions. (That Josiah, who in no case ever attained the age of fifty years, and according to the received text of 2 Ki. 22:1 not even that of forty years, was still a *yeled* ['youth,' cf. 1 Ki. 12:8 ff.] when he embarked upon his successful program of restoration is obvious.)

This leads to another stylistic observation: Is it an accident that in Isa. 9:5a 'unto us a son is given' happens to be a pretty good interpretation of the name בן נתן לנו 'אשיהו? The root אש 'to give' (well known from Arabic and Ugaritic) occurs not only in this Hebrew name and in the names י(ה)אש and יאוש (Lachish ostraca and Elephantine papyri), but also in my opinion in Isa. 8:1–2, which I render as follows: And YHWH said unto me, Take thee a sheet of parchment (rd. post-bibl. נויל) and write thereon in ink (cf., or read, post-biblical (הרה) (a deed of) gift (read אורן, cf. Ugar. *uṣn*) to Maher-shalal-hash-baz. So I (did so and) took me faithful witnesses (viz., to the deed of gift), Uriah the priest (see 2 Ki. 16:10 ff.) and Zechariah (King Ahaz's father-in-law, 2 Ki. 18:2//2 Chr. 19:1) the son of Jeberechiah. [The root 'wš, and probably our very word 'ūšān, occurs in the name of 'šn 'bd 'hš 'Ushana, minister of Ahaz.' This official's seal was published by Torrey, *BASOR* 79 (Oct. 1940):27–28, and — with a better photograph — by Sukenik, *BASOR* 84 (Dec. 1941):17–18. The root 'wš in a footnote to Torrey's paper on pp. 28–29 and in an appendix to Sukenik's on pp. 18–19. Altho, as we learn in the latter passage, it was the substantive 'ūšān which suggested itself to Albright first, he decided in favor of a verbal form 'which has better parallels.' However, bearing in mind the proper names *Mattan-Yāhū* and *Matti-Yāhū* and the fact that, as we have just seen, Isa 8:1 probably attests the use of the substantive 'ūšān just for the reign of Ahaz, I think Albright's original surmise that 'šn' was a hypocoristicon of \**Ušan-Yāhū* was the more correct one.] [On Isa. 8:1–4 see further *J. N. Epstein Volume* (1949), p. 30.]

<sup>42</sup> I would fain hope that it will be obvious to all that a song which thanks the Almighty for *having*, in the reign of Josiah, *caused* 'a great light to shine' upon 'the people who have been walking in darkness' (Isa. 9:1) — *not for going to cause* it to shine — does not even purport to have been composed by the eighth century seer who foretold the hundred years' march thru oppressive gloom (8:21–22). On the contrary, Isa. (8:23) 9:1–6 may be paraphrased thus: 'The darkness which Thou didst announce to our fathers' fathers by the foregoing words of Isaiah Thou didst, for their sins, bring upon them and us. But now, by Thy grace and mercy, the people that walked in darkness etc.' Elsewhere the *zum himmel jauchzend* passage which follows upon a *zum tode betrübt* prediction of Isaiah is itself a prediction, but its literary, logical, and temporal relation to the pessimistic utterance which precedes it is the same as here. See provisionally *JBL* 66 (1947): iv.



Josiah, then, reconquered even Israelite Transjordan, or part of it, and in so doing came into conflict with the children of Ammon. That probably a portion of the Negeb was seized by the Edomites after Hezekiah's debacle in 701 (or perhaps even as early as in 734) and remained in their hands until the rise of Josiah has already been mentioned; so that the latter almost certainly trod upon this neighbor's toes too. That he also claimed for Judah or Israel any territory held by the Moabites is, however, not very probable, since the Moabite kingdom was in his day but a shadow of its former self.<sup>43</sup> However, for that very reason Moab, wedged in between Edom, the children of Ammon, and the Dead Sea, could not afford to be friendly to Judah when both of its sister-states were hostile to her. It is, moreover, not out of the question that Josiah, in restoring the ancient empire of king David, brought not only practically all of the former territories of Judah and Israel under his direct rule but also the three Transjordan states (minus such territories) under his suzerainty.<sup>44</sup> And even if he only trimmed their borders, without reducing their cores to protectorates, it would be surprising if we did not find the children of Esau and the children of Lot lined up against the children of Jacob the very next time the latter were in trouble.

Those neighbors must have recovered their independence, if they had lost it, immediately upon Josiah's death and Judah's subjection to Egypt in 609. It may have been in the same year that the children of Ammon recovered the land of Gad; for Necho, thinking it unsafe to suffer Judah to remain a powerful kingdom which might again try to block his passage from the

<sup>43</sup> See Albright, *Archaeology and the religion of Israel* (1942): 207 f. n. 72; *JBL* 61 (1942): 119. But Albright goes too far in surmising that the Moabite state ceased to exist after the Arab irruption of ca. 650 B. C. E.; contrast Jer. 27:3 (the date of which, as is well known, is — against v. 1 — in the reign of Zedekiah; see below n. 48), also 2 Ki. 24:2.

<sup>44</sup> As can be seen from Amos 9:11–12, 'rebuilding the fallen hut of David as of yore' means that 'he (David, thru his successor) shall inherit the remnant of Edom and all the nations upon whom his name was called (i. e., over which he exercised suzerainty).' (In v. 11 read with LXX והריסתיה *והריסתיה*; in v. 12 I read יירש and שמי. — See also Sellin, op. cit. [see above, n. 11a] ad loc.: L. Rost, *Zahn-Festgabe* [1928]: 229–236.)

coastal plain into Galilee and points north, may very well have deprived Josiah's successors (Jehoahaz and Jehoiakim) of Galilee and Samaria,<sup>44a</sup> in which case all of Transjordan would have become practically untenable for them. There is, however, no reason for supposing that Edom also made any considerable territorial gains in 609.

It was different in 598. When King Jehoiakim of Judah rebelled against Nebuchadrezzar, the new lord of the Fertile Crescent, in 600/599,<sup>45</sup> his fellow-vassals on the east and south preferred to fight for the continuation of Babylonian domination rather than for its overthrow (2 Ki. 24:2).<sup>46</sup> The reason was obviously because in the event of the former they would be able to retain whatever portion of the territories seized from them by Josiah they had regained after his death and to recover the remainder and much more, whereas in the event of the latter they could hardly doubt but a successful Jehoiakim would endeavor to duplicate in some measure the feat of his father. Needless to say, they attained all their objectives. If Judah had not been expelled from the land of Gad before, it certainly was now, and it lost the Negeb into the bargain.<sup>47</sup> In the latter case

<sup>44a</sup> Cf. above, n. 18.

<sup>45</sup> Albright, *JBL* 51 (1932): 86.

<sup>46</sup> As Rudolph has noted on page 19 of his commentary on Lamentations (Kommentar zum A. T. XVI) — not available in this country but cited by Haller, *Die Fünf Megillot (Handbuch zum A. T., Erste reihe, 18)*, p. 94 — Lam. 1 presupposes only the catastrophe of 598, not yet that of 587. Jerusalem and her temple are humiliated and desolate, but not destroyed — and v. 10 is a clear allusion to the marauding neighbors of 2 Ki. 24:2; cf. Deut. 23:4, 8. Perhaps Jer. 12:7–13 alludes to the same thing. But as for the following vv., 14–17, which Rudolph *ZAW* 60 (1944): 99, l. 12 from below, treats as genuine (at least v. 14), they are disturbingly reminiscent of the 'yes, but' passages in Isa. 1–39 (see above n. 42).

<sup>47</sup> It is well known that (a) the Negeb was not a part of the Persian province of Judah (cf. the localities named in Neh. 3) and (b) the list of the returned exiles (Ezr. 2; Neh. 7:6 ff.) does not include people of Negebite origin. With these negative data Alt, *Palästina-jahrbuch* 21 (1925): 108 combines (c) Jer. 13:19, and infers that the Judah of 587, from which the exiles had been deported, had not included the Negeb, and consequently that the latter had been detached from it in 598. I would add that in the cited verse of Jeremiah the root *sgr* means practically 'to snatch away,' *ptḥ* 'to give back' (and *gly*

the beneficiaries were the Edomites. For while we do not know just what the official status of the Negeb was immediately after 598,<sup>47a</sup> we do know that by the second century B. C. E. the entire area was known as Idumaea and its inhabitants were (exclusively?) heathen until forcibly converted to Judaism by John Hyrcanus ca. 125 B. C. E. So whether the Negeb was handed to the Edomites or made a separate province, they must in any case have been in a position to begin infiltrating and encroaching upon Jewish pastures, cisterns, springs, etc., practically without delay.

It had, therefore, been worth the while of Judah's eastern and southeastern neighbors to help Nebuchadrezzar in 600–598.

perhaps 'to be alienated'). Cf. on the one hand Job 11:10 (reading perhaps *yaḥtoṣ* — cf. *ibid.* 9:12 — for *yaḥloṣ*) and on the other Amos 1:6, 9. In both the Amos verses *le'dōm* is a gloss due to a misaken notion that *hisgīr* must mean 'to deliver over' (disproved by Job 11:10) and suggested by Amos 1:11. With *le'dōm* out, v. 6 has after 'šībennū 4 unbalanced beats, just like 1:3 and 2:1; while v. 9 has in the same position a 3+3 line, just like 1:13 and 2:6 (1:11 and 2:4 having a 3+2 line at that point but being of questionable authenticity). For the true historical interpretation of v. 6 (and 9 if authentic) see above n. 2a and the text preceding it. (In Amos 2:1 מֹלֵךְ אָדָם is the Phoenician *molk* 'adōm 'human victim,' as was seen by Torczyner, *Hal-lashon wehas-sefer* I [1948]: 64 ff.)

<sup>47a</sup> In view of my own conclusions about Edomite encroachment upon the eastern Negeb in 701 and perhaps already in 734 (see above nn. 5 and 11b), I am very favorably inclined towards the following suggestion of Albright (letter of Nov. 13, 1947): 'I Esdras 4:50, which has been shown pretty convincingly by Torrey to belong to the original of the Chronicler's work, states that the Edomites had occupied Jewish villages before the outset of the reign of Darius. Now, later data make it certain that the Edomites occupied the territory around Adorea, Marisa and Hebron, i. e., the southern hill-country of Judah, not the Negeb of Simeon, which seems to have been detached from the Jewish state in 598 B. C., as you have observed. I have long been convinced that the valuable (though generally underestimated) document preserved in I. Chron. 9=Neh. 11 records correctly an early postexilic phase, and that the list of towns of the Negeb in Neh. 11: 25–28 (where Kirjath-arba is certainly wrong) reflects the fact that some of these alienated towns escaped destruction and continued to be inhabited by Jews (under Arab suzerainty) in the Persian period. In other words, we must carefully distinguish between the "Negeb of Simeon," which was not Edomite, and the southern hill-country of Judah, south of Beth-zur, which became Edomite in the sixth century.'



But having gained the objectives of that collaboration, they were now free to think about ways and means of getting rid of the Babylonian's yoke. It was to discuss them that they and the Phoenician states of Tyre and Sidon sent delegates to Jerusalem early in the reign of Zedekiah (Jer. 27:1 ff.).<sup>48</sup> When, however, Judah revolted for the last time in the ninth year of Zedekiah (589), the Phoenicians and the Ammonites were with her, but the Edomites (and Moabites?) were not.

The current view, to be sure, is that the Ammonites were not either, and that all of the Transjordan states assisted Nebuchadrezzar from the start, as in 600–598. But if they had, Jews would not have found refuge from the Chaldeans in these countries (Jer. 40:11–12): they would have been either slain or enslaved upon arrival. In the last stages, it is true, little Edom rushed to the aid of the victor<sup>49</sup> (for there is nothing new under the sun); and since Zedekiah's very next step if he had won his independence from Nebuchadrezzar would certainly have been the recovery of the Negeb (a historical and vital part of the kingdom of Judah), Bozrah had probably identified its interests from the outset with those of Babylon. But so long as a still powerful Judah lay between the Edomites and the Babylonians the former naturally deemed discretion the better part of valor. For analogous reasons of geography and relative strength, the Moabites — supposing that they had desired to help the Chaldeans out of spite against the Ammonites (who in the course of centuries had absorbed most of what was originally Moabite territory)<sup>50</sup> — had no choice but to remain neutral until Nebuzaradan's troops had all but disposed of their northern neighbors.

For the statesman on the banks of the Jabbok, knowing that the likelihood that even an independent Judah would produce a second Josiah was remote, while any other sort of king of Judah would be content to stay west of the Jordan (and not improbably

<sup>48</sup> That the date of 27:1 is an intrusion from 26:1 can be seen by comparing 27:3, 12, 16 ff. The fourth year of Zedekiah is usually substituted on the basis of 28:1 and 51:59.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Obad. 10–14; Ps. 137:7 (tho this verse looks curiously like an interpolation); Lam. 4:21–22.

<sup>50</sup> See refs. to Albright, above n. 43.

dreaming of a Greater Ammonite state, somewhat on the lines of modern Transjordan, that could ward off even a Josiah), had thrown in their lot with the rebels. The evidence for this is overwhelming.

First of all, Ezek. 21:23–27 certainly rules out active loyalty to Nebuchadrezzar (*à la* 600–598) on the part of the children of Ammon, and for non-quibblers it rules out even their outward loyalty. If Nebuchadrezzar had merely suspected their intentions, he would not have contemplated first frittering away his energies on a siege of Rabbah while neglecting Jerusalem, about whose intentions there was no doubt. After all, there can not have been any question of forestalling a sudden attack by the Ammonite dwarf upon the Babylonian giant.<sup>51</sup>

The fact that the children of Ammon were in open revolt against Babylon sheds a new light on some others. First of all, it makes some sense of Zedekiah's flight 'by the way of the Arabah,' or Jordan valley, when Jerusalem became untenable (2 Ki. 25:4–5//Jer. 39:4–5//52:7–8): once over the Jordan he would be on Ammonite soil, where, in modern parlance, he could set up a Jewish Government in Exile. He was overtaken, in the plains of Jericho, before he could ford the stream; but another scion of the house of David, 'Ishmael son of Nethaniah son of Elishama, of the royal seed and (of) the magnates of the king' (Jer. 41:1), did find refuge with Baalis, the king of the children of Ammon. That the king of the still unoccupied rebel country should have encouraged the pretender to the throne of the occupied one to assassinate Gedaliah, the collaborationist governor, the Chaldean officials or soldiers whom the conquerors had stationed at Mizpah, and anybody suspected of sympathizing with Gedaliah (Jer. 40:1–41:10), is the most natural thing in the world. That Ishmael was a mere hireling, or was only gratifying a petty jealousy of Gedaliah without any hope of restoring the Davidic kingdom, or that Baalis (like modern commentators) was so silly as to think that Nebuchadrezzar

<sup>51</sup> Remember we are not discussing pretexts but motives. With Tyre and Judah in revolt, Nebuchadrezzar would not be looking for a pretext for dissipating his energies elsewhere.

would only punish Ishmael and his countrymen but would reward Ishmael's instigator and the latter's countrymen with a slice of Judah — *credat Judaeus Apella*.<sup>52</sup> From the internal evidence of Jer. 40–41 alone (without my above arguments from Ezekiel and from Zedekiah's flight to the Jordan), Dalman<sup>53</sup> was able to reconstruct the true state of affairs.<sup>54</sup>

Had the Jewish leaders in Gedaliah's entourage followed the advice of Jeremiah and stayed put, another Judean might have been appointed in Gedaliah's stead and some sort of autonomous Jewish community might have survived in Palestine. However, the group around Mizpah migrated instead to Egypt. Consequently we only hear of a punitive measure, which was inevitable after Ishmael's anti-Chaldean exploit, but not of subsequent gestures of conciliation on the part of the Babylonians. The punitive measure in question is the deportation of the year 582 (Jer. 52:30).<sup>55</sup> It may have followed very shortly upon the offense, since we are not told in what year Ishmael committed it (but only the month, Jer. 41:1). For aught we know some of the Judean sites which archeological exploration has found to have been abandoned ca. 600 B. C. E. were only depopulated at this time (not already in 587).

But archeological exploration has further established that Transjordan was also largely depopulated in the sixth century, and — with the apparent exception of Edomite Elath — *early* in the sixth century. Not only that, but — again with the excep-

<sup>52</sup> I can only hope that Rudolph's commentary, which as I have said is unobtainable in America, does not repeat these theories [It does.]

<sup>53</sup> *Palästina-jahrbuch* 21 (1925): 81.

<sup>54</sup> That Ezekiel accuses the children of Ammon of rejoicing at Judah's desolation (Ezek 25:3) no more disproves that they were still holding out against Nebuchadrezzar after Judah's collapse than his similar accusation against Tyre in the very next chapter (26) cancels the evidence (including Ezekiel's own testimony, chs. 26–28; 29:17 ff.) for Tyre's stubborn resistance to Nebuchadrezzar for many years after the fall of Jerusalem. On the date of the siege of Tyre by Nebuchadrezzar (585–572) see most recently Eissfeldt, *Ras Shamra und Sanchuniaton* (1939): 4–8.

<sup>55</sup> That Jer. 52:28–30 is defective is probable, but one hesitates to adopt an emendation like that of Volz, *Der prophet Jeremia* (= *Kommentar zum A. T. X.*), ad loc., which eliminates the third deportation altogether.



tion of Elath (to which further exploration may add some more Edomite sites) — sedentary occupation of Transjordan south of the Jabbok was almost completely interrupted from the early sixth to the early third centuries.<sup>56</sup> In other words, the Arabs of the desert to the east, who are known from Assurbanapal's annals to have attempted to overrun Transjordan around the middle of the seventh century, succeeded in doing so early in the sixth. We shall hardly go wrong if we say that it was Nebuchadrezzar's doughty general Nebuzaradan, who executed the aforementioned Jewish deportation of 582 (and had previously executed that of 587), who, by creating a vacuum in Transjordan thru devastating punitive action in or about 582,<sup>57</sup> in effect sucked the sons of the east into the land of the children of Ammon and its neighbors.<sup>58</sup>

That the steady penetration of the Negeb by Edomites was due at least in part to Arab pressure in their rear is well known.

<sup>56</sup> See Glueck, *AASOR* 18/19 (1939): 269 above; *The Smithsonian report for 1941*, p. 474 ll. 15–17, p. 476 second paragraph; *The other side of the Jordan* (1940): 21, 149.

<sup>57</sup> Says Josephus, *Ant.* X 181: "... in the fifth year after the sacking of Jerusalem, which was the twenty-third year of the reign of Nebuchadrezzar, the latter marched against Coele-Syria and, after occupying it, made war both on the Moabites and on the Ammonites." That he merely inferred this from Jer. 44–49 (so Marcus *ad loc.*) is improbable in view of his silence about Edom, Kedar, and Elam. As a matter of fact, in Josephus the term 'Coele-Syria' itself apparently betrays dependence upon an older Greek source (see Bickerman, *RB* 54 [1947]:264), in the present instance presumably Berossus.

<sup>58</sup> It is specifically the land of the children of Ammon that is threatened with being converted into a stamping-ground for the children of the east and their cattle by Ezekiel (25:1–5), a prediction whose agreement with events is uncanny.

## DEMOCRATIC ORIGINS IN ANCIENT ISRAEL — THE BIBLICAL 'ĒDĀH

By ROBERT GORDIS

The characteristic Jewish thought that life itself may be compared to a book is strikingly exemplified in the career of Professor Alexander Marx. His devoted study of Jewish life through the ages has made him an eminent historian, and his warm love for Jewish books has given him a position of matchless authority as a bibliographer.

It is a privilege to dedicate this study in Biblical history to a beloved teacher and distinguished scholar with the prayer that he may be granted many more years of creative achievement and happy fellowship in the circle of his family, friends and colleagues.

### I

One of the most interesting by-products of recent trends in Biblical studies has been the rehabilitation of several Biblical writers, whose reputation for credibility had fallen very low during the past half century. Thus, the Chronicler was dismissed as a Midrash on the Book of Kings, who was not needed when he repeated the same sources and was not believed when he differed from, or supplemented, the older historian. Basically, he had concocted an artificial construction of Biblical history, reading into First Temple days the characteristic religious institutions of the Second Temple. Recent scholars, on the other hand, like Alt, von Rad, Albright and Noth now approach the

material in Chronicles with new respect for its credibility, or at least for its importance.<sup>1</sup>

The same process of restitution is due the sections in the Pentateuch attributed by the critics to the "Priestly Code." These narratives of the Wilderness period were described as a *Rückbildung* from Second Temple days and the legal enactments were discounted as lacking any historical validity for pre-exilic Israel. In accordance with the dominant critical view of post-exilic Judaism as a church-state, the Biblical terms *'ēdāh* and *kāhāl* were taken to mean "the community of Israel collectively regarded as a congregation."<sup>2</sup> According to Driver, P's aim is to present "an ideal picture of the Mosaic Age, constructed indeed upon a genuine traditional basis, but so conceived as to exemplify the principles by which an ideal theocracy should be regulated."<sup>3</sup> Pfeiffer, in his indispensable *Introduction*, summarizes the critical view by describing P as "the constitution of the Jewish theocratic state," whose purpose it was "to make a holy nation out of the Jews, a church within the Empire," "a sort of monastic order." Pfeiffer naturally has a low opinion of P's credibility: "even though some of the characters in P's story, like Moses, are genuine, the work as a whole is dogmatic rather than historical. It is an account of the establishment of an imaginary Utopia."<sup>4</sup> In similar vein, George Foot Moore, commenting on Judges 20:1, disregards the obviously primitive character of the incidents of the concubine of Gibeah and of the war of reprisal against Benjamin, and says, "Every word betrays

<sup>1</sup> Cf. von Rad, *Das Geschichtsbild der Chronistischen Werke*, (Stuttgart, 1930); Martin Noth, *Ueberlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (Halle 1943); W. F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, (Baltimore, 1940), p. 208.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. J. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, p. 205; J. A. Selbie, in Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 467 a.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. S. R. Driver, *Intr. to Lit. of O. T.*, (12 ed.), 1906, p. 128.

<sup>4</sup> R. H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to O. T.* (1941). Our quotations will be found on pp. 208, 190 and 191.



the post-exilic author — the congregation, the religious assembly takes the place of the people.”<sup>5</sup>

This conception of the late date of the oldest Biblical traditions was first shaken, shortly after its classic formulation, through the discovery of Babylonian parallels to the Creation Story, the Flood and other Biblical traditions and allusions. When the evidence could no longer be ignored, it was explained that during the Babylonian Exile the Jews had access to Babylonian sources whence they drew these traditions and some mythological references. But the mass of material recently accumulating in Ugaritic literature from the second millenium has made this explanation increasingly untenable.<sup>6</sup>

The breach in the hyper-critical attitude toward the Penta-teuchal narratives has continued to widen. The portable Tabernacle and the Ark of the Covenant, originally dismissed as inventions of Second Temple writers, were now discovered to have authentic parallels in the portable Ark of the nomadic Arabs,<sup>7</sup> and to be completely out of keeping with a sedentary agricultural society in Canaan. Thus, as Albright has indicated, a Mosaic date for the Ark and the Tabernacle, both as a whole and in many of the details, provides the best theory for their origin.<sup>8</sup>

The elaborate sacrificial system enjoined in Leviticus was once confidently explained as a late construction based upon the Second Temple cult, manifestly out of question for an early

<sup>5</sup> G. F. Moore, *ICC on Judges*, p. 423.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *inter alia*, J. H. Patton, *Canaanite Parallels in the Books of Psalms*, (Balt. 1944), esp. p. 27 f. and the literature there cited.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. H. Lammens, “Le culte des bétyles et les processions religieuses chez les Arabes pré-Islamiques” in *Bull. Inst. Franc. Arch. Orient.* XVII (Cairo 1917); J. Morgenstern, “The Ark, the Ephod and the Tent of Meeting,” in *HUCA*, 1942-3, 1944 and separately.

<sup>8</sup> Albright, *op. cit.*, p. 203, declares: “It is captious to refuse them a Mosaic date.” This is queried by T. J. Meek, *JNES*, Vol. II. 1943, pp. 123.

period. But the Tariff of Sacrificial Dues found at the Carthaginian Temple of Baal Zephon<sup>9</sup> speaks of the 'ōlāh, š'lāmīm and the minhāh. These sacrifices are obviously far older than the 5th or 4th century date of the inscription, and doubtless reflect the age-old practice of the mother country, Phoenicia. This conclusion is now validated by Ugaritic literature where š'lāmīm and other offerings are referred to.<sup>10</sup>

As a matter of fact, it should have been recognized long ago that this conception of the post-exilic Jewish community as a church-state rested on exceedingly weak foundations. The new community was so little a church that it rebelled at least once against Persian suzerainty under Zerubbabel, and enjoyed sufficient autonomy to have its own coins with the designation יהד in Hebrew letters.<sup>11</sup> The group antagonisms revealed by the Book of Nehemiah are ethnic rather than religious and his complaint about intermarriage is that "the children spake half in the speech of Ashdod and could not speak in the language of the Jews" (Neh. 13:24). This people, too, carried on a long and bitter war against the Seleucide empire, not only for religious freedom but for political independence as well. While the Temple cult was, to be sure, carried on by priests, as in all ancient religions, a new democratic, non-hierarchical institution, the synagogue, had come into being. Within its confines, there grew up the imposing corpus of the Oral Law, by which the masses of the people lived and in the development of which the priests played no part. The sects of the Second Commonwealth differed politically and socially as well as religiously. Obviously religion penetrated every aspect of the national life, but the life was

<sup>9</sup> Cf. CIS, I, no. 165; G. A. Barton, *Archaeology and the Bible*, Seventh ed. (Phila. 1937) pp. 439 ff.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. H. L. Ginsberg, *Kitbe Ugarit* (Jerusalem 1936) pp. 111 f., 116.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. E. L. Sukenik, "The Oldest Coin of Judea" in *Journ. Pal. Orient. Soc.*, Vol. XIV, 1934, pp. 78 ff.; Vol. XV, 1935, pp. 341 ff.

national, not merely ecclesiastical. In sum, whether the Jewish community of Second Temple days enjoyed independence, as under the Hasmoneans and Herod, or merely autonomy, as under Persian, Ptolemaic, Seleucide and Roman suzerainty, it constituted a religio-ethnic group, a people.

## II

Thus, there was no *ecclesia* in the post-exilic period which could serve as a prototype for the Biblical author's conception of Israel in pre-exilic and even in Canaanite days. A careful study of the Biblical usage of *'ēdāh* and *kāhāl* makes it clear that in the vast majority of instances, neither represents a *congregatio*. Far from being an artificial construction of a later age, these terms shed light upon the earliest form of community life in Israel. A clue to their true meaning may be found in the usage of a kindred Semitic community, that of Mesopotamia, recently studied by Thorkild Jacobsen.<sup>12</sup>

Defining democracy as a form of government in which internal sovereignty resides in a large proportion of the governed, namely in all free adult male citizens without distinction of fortune or class (p. 159), he points out that in historic times (roughly from the second millenium onward), autocracy prevailed, with one individual uniting in himself the legislative, judicial and executive powers (p. 160). All the more remarkable, therefore, are the unmistakable evidences of democracy in that civilization. Thus, in the Assyrian merchant colonies in Asia Minor, the judicial power was vested in a general assembly of all the colonists, *kārum šaḥir rabi*, "the colony, (lit. the quay), young and old." Even in the centralized structure of the old Babylonian Empire, where the king is the supreme judge, the town (*alum*) or the

<sup>12</sup> Primitive Democracy in Ancient Mesopotamia" in *JNES*, Vol. II, 1943, pp. 159-172. All page references are to this paper.



assembly (puḫrum) heard cases, cited the parties and executed judgment in trials (p. 162).

It is obvious that this democratic spirit in the judiciary institution is thoroughly at variance with the dominant autocracy. Was it the result of new tendencies just beginning to gain a foothold, or the vestigial remains of earlier times? Jacobsen decides very plausibly that the latter is the case, for he finds evidence that in the older traditions, the assembly enjoys greater powers than merely the judicial. Thus the assembly in the days of the kings of Akkad chose the king (p. 165), while the Gilgamesh epic indicates that King Agga of Kish does not declare war until the "elders" of Uruk and the men of the town have given their approval.

Moreover, Mesopotamian mythology, which pictures the gods in human form, describes an assembly of all the gods (*i-puuh-ri kala i-li*, p. 167). When a decision had to be reached, the gods would assemble, stimulate their faculties by strong drink and then take to the business in hand, with the *ilu rabiutum*, "the great (or senior) gods" having the first, but by no means the only voice. The final decision lay in a group of "seven gods who determine destiny."

We may also cite the graphic picture of the assembly of the gods as the basic source of authority given in the Babylonian epic *Enûma Elish*. After both Ea and Anu have failed to conquer Ti'âmat, Anshar, father of the gods, charges Marduk with the task. Marduk exults in the words of his father, but he demands that the assembly of gods delegate its authority to him (Note the words in italics below):

"If I am to be your champion,  
To vanquish Ti'âmat and to keep you alive,  
Summon a meeting, make my lot unsurpassable  
and proclaim it.

When ye are joyfully seated in the Assembly Hall,  
 May I through the utterance of my mouth determine  
     the destinies, *instead of you*.  
 Whatever I create shall remain unaltered,  
 The command of my lips shall not return (void),  
     it shall not be changed."<sup>13</sup>

The condition laid down by Marduk recalls Jephthah's demand that the elders and the people appoint him their head and captain, before he consents to lead them against the Ammonites (Judges 11:9-11).

Among the Sumerians, the royal rule was limited to a *bala* or term of office. Hence, the assembly of the gods had the authority not only to confer kingship, but also to withdraw it at will.

This type of assembly is met with in another area of the Semitic world, in Syria. Professor John A. Wilson has recently shown that such an assembly bearing the name of *mō'ed*, with at least consultative powers, existed in Byblos.<sup>14</sup> In the Egyptian tale of Wen-Amon (c. 1100 B. C.), the wandering hero tells that when he was about to leave Gebal, certain enemies, the Theker, demanded his arrest. The beginning of the hearing is described in these words (2:70 f.): "When morning came, he (Zakar-ba-'al, the prince of Gebal) had his *mw'd* summoned, and he stood in their midst and he said to the Theker, 'Why have ye come?' "

<sup>13</sup> *Enūma Elish*, Tablet II, ll. 123-29 repeated verbatim in Tablet III ll. 58-64. The translation is that of A. Heidel, *The Babylonian Genesis* (Chicago, 1942) pp. 20, 23.

<sup>14</sup> I am indebted to Prof. Albright for this reference to the significant paper of J. A. Wilson, "The Assembly of a Phoenician City," in *JNES*, Vol. IV, 1945, p. 245. In notes 2 and 5, Prof. Wilson cites Gardiner's tentative suggestion that the word in question means "bodyguard" and his doubts about the identification with "assembly." The evidence adduced in the present paper on the Hebrew terms *'ēdāh* and *mō'ēd* strongly supports Wilson's view.

This primitive democracy has been noted also in the Teutonic folk-moot, the institutions of Homeric Greece and among the Hittites.<sup>15</sup>

### III

Is there any evidence for a similar institution among the ancient Hebrews?<sup>16</sup> The evidence, too long disregarded, lies in the frequent Biblical use of *'ēdāh* and *kāhāl*.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Jacobsen (op. cit. n. 72) cites W. J. Shepard, *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, IX, 355; also VII, p. 11 and O. Schrader, *Reallexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde* (2nd. ed. Leipzig, 1917-29) art. "König" and "Volksversammlung" for Europe; Glotz, *The Greek City and its Institutions* (New York 1930), pp. 39-57, for the Greeks, and Hardy "The Old Hittite Kingdom," *AJSL*, LVIII, 1941, pp. 214 f. for the Hittites.

<sup>16</sup> It is the merit of Abram Menes, (*Die Vorexilischen Gesetze Israels, Beiheft 50, ZATW*, Giessen 1921) to have noted the existence of a *Volksversammlung* in Israel and to have made some illuminating observations about it (pp. 21-3, 88-96). However, a fresh and fuller treatment of the subject is in order, for several reasons which can be indicated only briefly. Though Menes recognizes the technical use of *hakhāl* "to convene (the assembly)" (p. 21) he fails to note that *'ēdāh* and secondarily *kāhāl* are the technical names for this group. Lacking the evidence now available to us, he declares that such an institution is "zwar dem vorderen Orient sonst unbekannt" (ibid). Perhaps because he is under the influence of the Wellhausen school, which treats Pentateuchal data with suspicion unless attested to by the Historical Books, he inverts the entire history of the institution, declaring "die antike Demokratie konnte sich nur in einem Stadtstaat behaupten" (p. 88) but not in an agricultural civilization. That its true provenance might lie in a nomadic society does not occur to him. Hence for him, the peoples' assembly begins to attain importance in Deuteronomy and "die Kompetenz der Volksversammlung in deuteronomischer Zeit bedeutend erweitert wurde" (p. 89). He interprets the stress in Deut. (and for that matter in Ex.) upon the acceptance of the Law at Sinai by the entire people as a throwback to early conditions (ibid.) from the monarchical period, when the people's assembly was considered the highest organ of the state (p. 90). Noting the existence of the "elders" as a kind of senate in the folk assembly, he regards them as generally friendly toward the larger body (for which he compares II Kings 23:1 ff) but sometimes as hostile (p. 9). For this latter attitude he finds evidence in a contrast he draws between Ex. 24:7 and 24:9, but the proof is unconvincing. The *šōf'ṭīm* or judges frequently referred to in Deuteronomy, he regards as a democratic institution (p. 92) since the people are bidden to select them (16:18). It seems more



While modern scholars have seen in these terms evidence of a church-state conception of Israel, earlier students sought to discover fine-spun differences between the two terms. Thus, in Augustine's distinction between the Greek ἐκκλησία, Latin *convocatio* and the Greek συναγωγή, Latin *congregatio*, the theological animus is clear from his remark that the former is the nobler term, since it is used only of human beings, while the latter may be applied to cattle!<sup>18</sup> Vitranga defines *kāhāl* (= *ecclesia*) as *universam alicuius populi multitudinem* and 'ēdāh (συναγωγή, *congregatio*) as *quemcumque hominum coetum et conventum*.<sup>19</sup> LXX generally renders 'ēdāh by συναγωγή and *kāhāl* by

plausible to assume that the judges represent the extension of the royal power, which generally attempted to break down the autonomy of the tribes and of such older institutions as the folk-assembly, in which the elders played a significant role. Menes may possibly be correct in regarding the judicial function of the priests as a later development (p. 93), but the problem is a vexing one and requires further study. Notwithstanding these criticisms, his treatment is a highly suggestive and valuable contribution to the subject.

It should be added that our own paper was projected in 1943 and its reading was announced in the program of the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in December of that year. Due first to illness and then to other commitments, it was not read until the 1946 Meeting of SBL. At that time, Dr. C. Umhau Wolf of Chicago Lutheran Seminary was kind enough to inform me that he had been working on the same theme, and that his paper was scheduled to appear in *JNES*. Upon exchanging copies of our manuscripts, we both found that while there were naturally points of resemblance, there was complete independence in the approach and in many of the conclusions, particularly with regard to 'ēdāh and *kāhāl*, which, as Dr. Wolf wrote, he had not touched. His paper has since been published in *JNES*.

<sup>17</sup> 'Ēdāh (including suffixes) occurs 145 times, aside from Hos. 7:12, which is probably corrupt. *Kāhāl* is nearly as frequent, occurring 124 times. The verb *kāhal* occurs 19 times in the *Niphal* and 20 in the *Hiphil*. *Kehillah* occurs twice, in Neh. 5:7, where it is probably a metaplastic form for *kol* "voice" (cf. F. Zimmermann in *JBL* 1931, Vol. 50, pp. 311 f.) and in Deut. 33:4, on which see the interesting suggestion of H. Torczyner "The Words of Koheleth" in *Studies in Memory of Moses Schorr* (Hebrew) p. 149 ff. *Makhēlēm* and *makhēlōth* occur once each (Ps. 26:12; 68:27).

<sup>18</sup> Cf. J. A. Selbie in Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. 1, p. 466a; A. R. S. Kennedy, *ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 17.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. *De Synagoga Vetere* (2nd. ed.) 1726, pp. 80, 88.

ἐκκλησία (so in Deut., Josh., Judg., Sam., Kings, Chron.-Ezra-Neh., Ps.)<sup>20</sup> but *kahal* is translated *συναγωγή* in Ex., Lev., Num.

Actually no genuine distinction in meaning exists between these two terms, different writers preferring one or another term.

Thus Driver notes that *ʿedah* is used in P and rarely in the Historical Books (Judges 20:1; 21:10, 13, 16; 1 Kings 8:5=2

Ch 5:6), while *kahal* is used in Deut. and Chron-Ezra-Neh. This is no more than a stylistic predilection, as is evident from the

fact that both words are used interchangeably throughout the Psalms, as well as in many parallel phrases such as *ʿadaḥ yisrāʾel*

Ex. 12:3 || *kēhal yisrāʾel* Deut. 31:30; *ʿadaḥ yisrāʾel* Num. 27:17 || *kēhal JHWH* (Num. 16:3; 20:4) || *kēhal ʿelohim* (Neh.

13:1). That this preference is not absolute is clear from the existence of such compound phrases as *kahal vʿedah* (Pr. 5:14;

16; *kēhal ʿadaḥ yisrāʾel* (Ex. 12:6), etc.

The etymology of both words also indicates their synonymous character — *kāḥal* from *kāhal* "to gather, assemble" and *ʿedah*

from *yāʿad* "meet, come together," exactly like the Akkadian *puḫrum* from *puḫrum* "assemble (cf. Ugaritic 𐎧𐎢 — "assembly

of the gods) and the 12 cent. Inscription of Yehawmilk of Byblos (𐎢𐎺𐎠 𐎧𐎢𐎺𐎠).

That both terms refer to the same institution is evident from the fact that they occur within the same passages, as e. g. the

sacrificial code in Lev. 4 (vv. 13, 15 *ʿedah*, v. 14 *kāḥal*), the Korah rebellion (Num. 16:2, 3) and the narrative in Judges

ch. 20, 21 (*edah* 20:1; 21:10, 13, 16; *kēhal ʿam* 20:2; *kāḥal* 21:5). This use of two distinct terms for the same institution is paralleled by the Babylonian use of *alum* "town" and *puḫrum*

"assembly" as alternatives.<sup>21</sup> That both *edah* and *kāḥal* could

<sup>20</sup> Except that in Dt. 5:19 and Ps. 40:11, *kahal* is rendered by *συναγωγή* (but in v. 10, it is given as *ἐκκλησία*).

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Jacobsen, op. cit., p. 162 f.

be used interchangeably for each other and often for *‘ām* “people” is additional evidence, if any were required, that this “public assembly” was really “the commonalty, the citizenry,” coinciding with the entire male adult population.

On the other hand, it seems clear from a detailed study of the Biblical usage of both terms, that *‘ēdāh* is the original technical term for “assembly” while *kāhāl* means “the people” as a collective unit. The root *yā‘ad* means not merely “to gather” but “to meet by appointment” cf. Am. 3:3 וַיִּזְכְּרוּ אֶם נִזְכְּרוּ; Josh. 11:5 וַיִּזְכְּרוּ כָּל הַמְּלָכִים הָאֵלֶּה; also Ps. 48:5; Job 2:11 and passim. Hence, *‘ēdāh* means “public assembly specifically convened.” This nuance of conscious meeting is lacking in the root *kāhāl*. The Akkadian usage is highly instructive here. While, as has been noted, the two terms *alum* “town” and *puḫrum* “assembly” are used interchangeably, it is clear that the basic term for “public assembly” is the latter, while the former is a borrowed epithet.

Moreover, in such passages as Lev. ch. 4 and Judges chap. 20–21, *‘ēdāh* is primary and *kāhāl* is secondary in terms of frequency and of importance (*‘ēdāh* 6 times, *kāhāl* 3). So too, in the legal and quasi-legal passages discussed below, where the precise technical term would tend to be preferred, *‘ēdāh* occurs 13 times as against 5 times for *kahal*.<sup>22</sup>

A passage like 1 Kings 12:20 is instructive in indicating that *‘ēdāh* represents the “people’s assembly” in its technical sense: וַיְהִי בִשְׁמֹעַ כָּל-יִשְׂרָאֵל בִּי-יָשָׁב יִרְבֶּעֶם וַיִּשְׁלְחוּ וַיִּקְרְאוּ אֹתוֹ אֶל-הָעֵדָה וַיִּמְלִיכוּ אֹתוֹ עַל-כָּל-יִשְׂרָאֵל (Note the use of *kol yisrā‘el* by the side of *‘ēdāh* and the phrase “they called him to the *‘ēdāh*,”

Finally, the verb generally used for “convening” is *hakhel*,

<sup>22</sup> *‘ēdāh* occurs in Ex. 12:3, 6, 19; Lev. 4:13, 15; 19:2; Num. 31:26, 27; 35:12, 24, 25; Josh. 20:6, 9. *Kāhāl* occurs in Lev. 4:14; Num. 15:15; 24; Dt. 31:30; Josh. 8:35.



*ya'ad* frequently bearing the connotation of "meeting with hostile intent."<sup>23</sup> The former verb is used 9 times with *'ēdāh*, הקהל את העדה (6 times in the Hiphil, 3 in the Niphal)<sup>24</sup> while it occurs with *kāhāl* only 3 times (הקהל את הקהל).<sup>25</sup> On the basis of all these considerations, it seems clear that *'ēdāh* is the authentic term for the "public assembly" in ancient Israel.

#### IV

Before seeking to trace the history of the institution in Israel, it is important to note the various categories in which *kāhāl* and *'ēdāh* are used in Biblical literature:

A — *As common nouns*, meaning "multitude, crowd." This non-technical use is quite natural, cf. the use as common nouns of English words like "congress," "assembly," by the side of their use as proper nouns.

*'Ēdāh* is the usual designation for Korah's band (Num. 17:7, 10, 11; 26:9, 10 and passim). It is used even of a cluster of bees (Jud. 14:15), and in many poetic phrases: עֶדְת מְרָעִים (Ps. 22:17); עֶדְת חֲנָף (Job 15:34); עֶדְת צַדִּיקִים (Ps. 1:5); בְּסוֹד יִשְׂרָאֵל (Ps. 111:1); עֶדְת לְאֻמִּים (Ps. 7:8); עֶדְת אֲבִירִים (Ps. 68:31); עֶדְת עֲרִיצִים (Ps. 86:14).

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Num. 14:35; 16:11; 27:3. The use of *yā'ad* is neutral in Num. 10:4; 1 K 8:5 = II Chr. 5:6.

<sup>24</sup> Hiphil — Ex. 35:1; Lev. 8:3; Num. 1:18; 8:9; 16:19; 20:8; Niphal — Lev. 8:4; Num. 17:7; Judg. 20:1.

<sup>25</sup> Num. 10:7; 20:10; Ezek. 38:13. Of these three verses, the last is in a poetic passage, and the other two are in sections where *'ēdāh* is common and the writer may have wished to vary his style. Thus in Num. 10:1-7 *'ēdāh* occurs twice (vv. 1, 3) before he uses *kāhāl* (v. 7). In Num. 20:7-13, *'ēdāh* occurs twice in v. 8, before *kāhāl* is used in v. 10, while *'ēdāh* again occurs in v. 11 and *kāhāl* again in v. 12. For the sake of completeness, it may be added that *hakhāl* occurs with *'am* (Dt. 4:10; 31:12), with *ʿkenim* (Dt. 31:28; 1 K 8:1 = 2 Ch. 5:2), with *bēth y'hudāh* (1 K:12:21 = 2 Ch. 11:1) and with *kol yisrā'el* (1 Ch. 13:5; 15:3).

*Kāhāl* is also a common noun in fixed phrases as: קהל עמים (Ezek. 32:3 a. e.); קהל גוים (Gen. 35:11; Jer. 50:9;); קהל קדשים Ps. 89:6. The phrase *k<sup>e</sup>hal JHWH* represents the entire people viewed as a sacred assembly and hence required to maintain itself free from contamination (Dt. 23:2 ff. a. e; cf. also Lam. 1:10).

B — The use of 'ēdāh and *kāhāl* in the *narratives of Pentateuch and the Historical Books* to refer to "the commonalty, the people assembled." It is the 'ēdāh which figures in the report of the Ten Spies (Num. 14:1 and passim, parallel to 'am), in the incident at Meribah, (Num. 20:1 ff.), the death of Aaron (Num. 20:22 ff.) and the avenging act of Phineas (Num. 25:6 ff.). Moses and the leaders are commanded to convene the assembly (*hakhēl 'et ha'ēdāh*) for the census (Num. 1:18). For gathering the commonalty, trumpets are ordained (מקרא העדה Num. 10:2; את הקהל Num. 10:7; cf. Joel 2:16 קדשו קהל).

The Sabbath violator is brought before Moses, Aaron and the 'ēdāh (Num. 15:33 ff.) and it is they who execute the blasphemer (Lev. 24:14 ff.). That the 'ēdāh is judicial rather than ecclesiastical in character is clear from the fact that the daughters of Zelaphehad appear before Moses, Eleazar, the princes and all the 'ēdāh to demand their rights of inheritance (Num. 27:2 ff.), as do the Transjordan tribes bringing their plea for pasture land (Num. 32:2 ff.).

The judicial function of the 'ēdāh is illustrated by Ps. 82:1, where the poet makes use of mythological overtones that are familiar from Akkadian and Ugaritic literature: אלהים נצב בפערת אל בקרב אלהים ישפט "God (originally JHWH) stands in the divine assembly, in the midst of the gods will He judge."<sup>26</sup>

<sup>26</sup> This Psalm is in the so-called "Elohistic Collection," Ps. 51-72, 42-49, 50, 73-83, where *JHWH* has been replaced by 'elōhīm. On Psalm 82, see the detailed study by Julian Morgenstern, "The Mythological Background of Psalm 82," *HUCA*, vol. XIV, 1939—pp. 29-126, esp. p. 39 ff. See his note 22 for his interpretation of this verse.

This divine assembly is convened in Isa. 14:13 on *har mō'ēd* "the mount of assembly" and was believed to take place in the "uttermost north." This synonymous use of *mō'ēd* and *'ēdāh* apparently occurs also in Num. 16:2, *n'sī'ēi 'ēdāh, k'ru'ēi mō'ēd*. It has its parallel also in the use of *mō'ēd* for assembly in Byblos.

All this would suggest a reconsideration of the familiar term *'ōhel mō'ēd*, used over 150 times in the Pentateuch and the Historical Books. In consonance with the theory of *'ēdāh* as a congregation, the phrase has been generally rendered as "tent of meeting" (RV) mainly for the purpose of declaring God's will to His people, hence practically equivalent to "the tent of revelation."<sup>27</sup>

It is, of course, obvious that God's will was made known there, but such passages as Ex. 25:22 *וְנוֹעַדְתִּי לָךְ שָׁם* (cf. 30:36), by the side of 29:43 *וְנוֹעַדְתִּי שָׁמָּה לְבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל* (cf. 29:42;) indicate that basically it is "the place of meeting between God and the assembled people, the *'ēdāh*." Cf. II Chron. 1:3, *'ōhel mō'ēd hā 'elōhim* lit. "the tent for meeting God" (objective genitive). The people might be represented by its leaders, Moses or Joshua,<sup>28</sup> by its religious functionaries, the Aaronides or the Levites at sacrifices and other ritual occasions,<sup>29</sup> or by its "princes or "elders" at judicial and other governmental functions.<sup>30</sup> For obvious physical reasons, these dignitaries probably did duty

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Brown-Driver-Briggs, *Lexicon*, p. 418a; Driver, *ICC on Deuteronomy*, p. 339. Less widely accepted are the views of Zimmern, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Babylonischen Religion*, p. 88, n. 2, who interprets it as "Orakelzelt," i. e. "the place where the proper time for an undertaking is determined" and of Meinhold, *Die Lade Jahvehs* (1900), p. 3 f. who interprets it as equivalent to *אֹהֶל הָעֵדוּת*, "the tent of testimony," and therefore regards LXX as correct in rendering both phrases by *σκηνη τοῦ μαρτυρίου*.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. e. g. Ex. 25:22; 30:36; Lev. 1:1; 10:9; Num. 1:1; 7:89; 12:4; Deut. 16:10.

<sup>29</sup> E. g. Ex. 40:31 f.; Num. Ch. 4, *passim*. Priests or Levites are mentioned in connection with *'ōhel mō'ēd* about 45 times, and sacrifices nearly as frequently.

<sup>30</sup> Num. 11:16; 27:2; Josh. 19:5.



for the *ēdāh*, as a whole, even in those cases where our sources speak of a gathering before the Tent of Meeting of the entire commonalty.<sup>31</sup> While the primitive democracy of the *‘ēdāh* was limited to males, it is interesting to note that the women also gathered at *‘ōhel mō‘ēd* (*haṣṣōbh‘ōth*, Ex. 30:8; I Sam. 2:22), probably for religious purposes only.

The *‘ēdāh* requires a leader “who will go out and come in before them” in war (Num. 27:16 ff.). In the war against Midian (ibid. 31:12, 13), the spoils are divided between the warriors in combat and the rest of the *‘ēdāh* (31:27). The commonalty as a military entity is referred to as *kāhāl* by Balak of Moab *עָתָה יִלְחָכוּ הַקָּהָל אֶת־יִצְחָק בְּבִיבְתֵינוּ* (Num. 22:4), by David before Goliath (I Sam. 17:47), and in the days of Jehoshaphat (II Chron. 20:5, 14).

Treaty-making is closely associated with the waging of war. The princes of the *‘ēdāh* made the treaty with the Gibeonites (Josh. 9:15 ff.). In the feud with Benjamin, as well as in the partial restitution made at the expense of the Jabesh-Gileadites, it is the *‘ēdāh* (or *kāhāl*) which operates (Jud. 20:1 ff; 21:5, 10 ff.).

C — *The most technical use of both terms* is to be found in legal and quasi-legal sections, to refer to “the people’s assembly.” Such are the sections dealing with the sin-offering for an error in judgment (Lev. 4:13, 15 *edāh*; 4:14; Num. 15:24 *kāhāl*), the trial of a murderer (Num. 35:12, 24, 25; Josh. 20:6, 9) and the division of the spoils of battle (Num. 31:26 ff.). The Paschal law is addressed to *kol ‘adat<sup>h</sup> Yisrā’ēl* (Ex. 12:3, 6, 19 and *passim*) as is the Holiness Code (Lev. 19:2). The great law of the equality of the alien and the citizen is addressed to the *kāhāl* (Num. 15:15 vocative *הַקָּהָל*). The Day of Revelation at Sinai is called *yōm hakkāhāl* in Deut. (9:10, 10:4; 18:16), a phrase which

<sup>31</sup> Lev. 8:3 f.; 9:5, 23 (*hā‘ām*); Num. 10:3; 14:10; 16:19; 17:17, 25:6; 27:2; Josh. 18:1.

emphasizes the binding character of the Law as accepted by the assembled commonalty of Israel. Similarly Moses recites his Farewell Song, as Joshua reads the Torah, before the *kāhāl* (Dt. 31:30; Josh. 8:35).

Obviously, in the ancient world, all these functions, most of which would today be described as secular, being concerned with political, judicial, economic and military affairs, were conducted under the aegis of religion, with appropriate rites and ceremonies. Nonetheless, the *'ēdāh* and *kāhāl* was not a congregation, a church, or a religious fellowship. It was the people's assembly, the supreme arbiter in all phases of the national life.

## V

It is now possible to reconstruct the history of this "public assembly" or "commonalty" in Israel, at least in its broadest outlines. Its existence in Mesopotamia, as well as analogies in non-Semitic societies like that of the Hittites and the Teutonic tribes, validate the Pentateuchal tradition which assigns it to the earliest stage of Israelite history. Its origins are to be sought for in nomadic society, in which a strong egalitarianism prevails and where no hierarchy of rulers or complex governmental structure is permitted to arise.<sup>32</sup>

Here each member is as important as any other, and has the right and opportunity of making his voice felt at the "assembly." Within it, to be sure, the elders, who are presumed to have wisdom as well as age, play a dominant role and their opinions carry great weight, particularly since no formal vote is taken, but rather a consensus is reached on issues confronting the

<sup>32</sup> Cf. the classic treatment of K. Budde, "The Nomadic Ideal in the O. T." in *New World*, 1895, pp. 726-45; J. W. Flight, "The Nomadic Idea and Ideal in the O. T." in *JBL*, Vol. 42, 1923, pp. 158 ff. We may perhaps be permitted to cite *inter alia* our paper, "The Bible as a Cultural Monument" in the forthcoming work, *Judaism and the Jews*, edited by Louis Finkelstein.

group, *viva voce*. It is doubtful whether the elders are to be regarded as a distinct body or Senate. They are rather *primi inter pares*, deriving their powers from the "commonalty" by popular consent.

Our sources speak of other leaders, perhaps more official in character and hence more permanent. These are referred to as *nesi'ē hā'ēdāh* (Ex. 16:22; Num. 16:2) *keri'ē hā'ēdāh* (Num. 1:16; 26:9) *keri'ē mō'ed* "called to the meeting" (Num. 16:2).

Religious functionaries also derive their authority from the same source, at least in a formal sense: The Levites are ordained by '*adat<sup>h</sup> benēi yisrā'el*' (Num. 8:9 f.). In the case of the priests, who possess a higher degree of sanctity, the '*ēdāh*' is convened to *witness* their consecration (Lev. 8:3 f.; 9:5).

Doubtless such "assemblies" existed in each tribe, but when the tribes unite, a larger commonalty emerges. In such cases, the tribal individuality does not disappear completely, but is expressed at least symbolically by the *rōš* or *nesi' hammatteh* (Num. 1:4, 16; 13:2). The '*ēdāh*' remains a vital force throughout the Wilderness period and the Conquest, when nomadism was either a reality or a recent memory.

As the supreme authority, representing the entire people, the assembly has an important role to play in the allocation of the land to the various tribes, since the decision is regarded as a kind of social contract in which all the tribes are equal. Moses had allocated the land to the Transjordan clans, with the approval of the '*ēdāh*' (Num. 32:2 ff.; Josh. 22:12 ff.). Joshua and the heads of the tribes (Josh. 24:1 f.) cast lots for the portions of Judah (ibid 15:1) and the Joseph tribes (16:1; 17:1 ff.). When these most powerful aggregations have been satisfied, the entire '*ēdāh*' under Joshua's leadership arranges for the division among the seven remaining tribes (Josh. 18:1 ff.).

As has already been noted, our Pentateuchal sources indicate that the '*ēdāh*' served as the judiciary in cases involving capital



punishment. Thus it sits in judgment on murder cases (Num. 35:12, 24, 25), Sabbath violation (Num. 15:33 ff.), and the blasphemer (Lev. 24:16). From Ezek. 16:40; 23:46 f., it is clear that it executed judgment on the adulterer, *kahal* being the term used by the prophet here.

The executive functions of the assembly include the making of war, wherein, of course, the priests are consulted for the will of God, the division of the spoils (Num. 31:26 ff.) and the making of treaties (Josh. 9:15 ff.). In the punishment of the Benjaminites, the '*ēdāh* performs two of its principal functions, it judges the guilty and decides on war.

As a settled agricultural society develops and the population grows, the '*ēdāh* becomes increasingly difficult to convene and unwieldy to conduct. Under somewhat similar circumstances, the New England town meeting developed from direct to representative democracy. In the ancient Near East, as the history of the Mesopotamian empires indicates, the primitive democratic structure evolved into a centralized monarchy. In Israel, to be sure, the king never attained to the absolute power of the Babylonian or Assyrian rulers. Nevertheless, the establishment of the monarchy meant the progressive weakening and the ultimate disappearance of the old order, which included the tribal system, the blood feud and the public assembly.

The first casualty is doubtless the judicial power, which must be transferred to the throne if the monarchy is to have any strength. In addition to his own activity, the king sets up judges in the gates of the cities.<sup>33</sup>

Nonetheless, the process is gradual. Exactly as the '*ēdāh* had brought the Ark to Shiloh in Joshua's day (Josh. 18:1), David invites the *kāhāl* to participate in bringing the Ark up

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Dt. 17:18; 21:19; 22:15; II Sam. 15:2; Am. 5:12, 19; Isa. 29:21; Pr. 24:7; 31:22; Job 5:4; 31:21; Ruth 4:1. 11.

from Kiryat Yearim (1 Ch. 13:2) and in making preparation for the building of the sanctuary (1 Ch. 29:1 ff.). The testimony of the Chronicler is in harmony with the report in I Kings (8:5 = II Chr. 5:6) of the participation of the *ʿedah* at the dedication of Solomon's Temple. After his death, it is the assembly that crowns Jeroboam king of Israel (I Ki. 12:3 *kāhāl*; 12:21 *ʿedah*).

It is uniquely characteristic of Israel that unlike other Semitic peoples, it retained the strong democratic impulse derived from the nomadic stage in the agricultural and urbanized culture of monarchical days. In addition to ancient historical memories, there was the ever-present example of the Transjordan tribes to recall "the kindness of Israel's youth, the love of its bridal state" (Jer. 2:1). There were such institutions as the Nazirate and such movements as the Rechabites that strove to revert to the past, albeit mechanically. In prophetism, the ideals of the nomadic stage were restated and deepened to meet the needs of a more advanced society.

In line with this strong democratic tendency, the *ʿedah* or *kāhāl*, the ancient public assembly, managed to survive. It is possible that its role at coronations was largely ceremonial, intended to give symbolic expression to the idea that the king was the legitimate ruler of the people, having been chosen by the commonalty. The example of the medieval German kings being crowned as rulers of the Holy Roman Empire is somewhat analogous. On the other hand, the fact that the assembly appears in moments of national crisis, religious or political, would imply that it still commanded prestige and that its consent, at the very least, was required to give a decision binding force. Thus according to our sources, the "assembly" participates in the restoration of the Davidic dynasty in the person of Jehoash after the assassination of Athaliah (2 Chron. 23:3), in the Reformation and Passover of Hezekiah (2 Chr. 29:28 ff.; 30:2 ff.)

and in the post-exilic decisions to separate from foreign wives (Ez. 10:12, 14) and to restore fields and vineyards taken on pledge (Neh. 5:13) in the days of Nehemiah. As at Sinai, the Reading of the Torah is carried out by the entire commonalty of Israel (Neh. 8:2 ff.).

The collective assembly of ancient Israel was never formally abolished. New conditions led to the diminution of its functions so that ultimately it was convened only in hours of critical importance.<sup>34</sup> But the positive democratic spirit which actuated it in its earliest period never died in Israel, and through the Bible, it entered the fabric of Western civilization.

<sup>34</sup> It is tempting to note the resemblances between these irregular convenings of the 'ēdāh and kāhāl in the Later Monarchy and the period of the Return on the one hand and the view propounded by Professor Solomon Zeitlin on the other concerning the post-exilic *k'neset hagg'dōlāh* (from *kānas* — "gather," cf. *yā'ad*, *kāhal*). According to his view, the "Great Assembly" frequently referred to in Rabbinic literature, in Josephus and the Apocrypha, was also convened only at critical moments in Jewish history. Doubtless the *k'neset hagg'dōlāh* was representative rather than all-inclusive, but that must have been true of the 'ēdāh in the later periods, at least. Cf. the discussion of this institution in S. Zeitlin, "The Origin of the Synagogue," in *Proc. Am. Acad. for Jew. Research*, 1930-31, pp. 79 f.



## IBN 'AḲNĪN'S COMMENTARY ON THE SONG OF SONGS

By A. S. HALKIN

As the depository of all truth and nothing but the truth, the Bible has had to keep pace with a dynamic world and a necessarily changing Jewish community. Inner development and contact with other and different civilizations during their long history widened the horizons of the disciplined group, and stirred the hearts and minds of the more sensitive and the more reflective members of the people. From time to time, new standards came into fashion and new points of view, and they had to conform to the truths of the Bible. When students engaged in the study of the Bible, the participants expounded the text in the light of their world and experiences. When a subject was discussed, passages were adduced from the Bible in proof of the position maintained. The treatment of Scripture in both cases has been designated conventionally by the term allegorization.<sup>1</sup> It is hardly necessary to refer to the limited sense in which the term is used. For it is not only amply clear to the modern student that the Bible was not originally an allegory but was so interpreted because of the exigencies of the times. It is further to be remembered that, with one or two exceptions, allegorical interpretation never denied the simple meaning of the text which was being subjected to this process.<sup>2</sup>

One such exception is represented by the Song of Songs and the attitude to it. Regardless of what its "original" meaning may have been, the unquestionable holiness of the collection

<sup>1</sup> See, among others, Professor Ginzberg's article "Allegorical Interpretation" in *JE*, I, 403 ff.; Lauterbach, "The Ancient Allegorists in Talmud and Midrash", *JQR*, N. S., I, 291 ff.; Heinemann, *Altjüdische Allegoristik*, 1936.

<sup>2</sup> Heinemann, *l. c.*, 5-14.

within which it was contained necessarily forced an attitude of piety and reverence towards this booklet alike to the attitude towards the other books. The respect owed the Song could not be reconciled with a literal explanation of the physical love and voluptuousness which characterize its contents. Allegorization became imperative, allegorization which insisted that King Solomon, its author, had never intended it to be regarded as anything but an allegory. The Rabbis taught: He who recites a verse of the Song of Songs and treats it as a (secular) air . . . brings evil into the world, for the Torah puts on sackcloth, appears before God, and complains: Your children have made of me a fiddle played by scoffers.<sup>3</sup>

It is very likely that the allegorical interpretation of Shir ha-Shirim grew gradually,<sup>4</sup> and did not at once, if ever, become the exclusive explanation. The discussions in the Mishna<sup>5</sup> reflect a sober difference of opinion among scholars regarding the status of the book, and Rabbinic testimony suggests quite plainly that before it was raised to canonical rank it had been considered to be a secular songster.<sup>6</sup> Evidence of later times, both Jewish and Christian, makes it clear that the view which maintained that Shir ha-Shirim was not a sacred writing, and was to be understood literally, did not die an easy or complete death. Generally opposed to allegorical interpretation,<sup>7</sup> Theodore of Mopsuestia (5th cent.), bishop of the Nestorian Church who

<sup>3</sup> Sanhedrin 101a (Salfeld, *Das Hohelied Salomos bei d. jüd. Erklärern*, 3 and Riedel, *Die Auslegung des Hohenliedes*, 5, erroneously: 111a). Kallah, I, 3, reads מְבֹל in place of רַעָה. It is interesting that Rashi seems to feel that the sin consists in the replacement of the traditional chant by another.

<sup>4</sup> While it can be plausibly contended that early Midrashic applications of words and phrases in the book (for illustrations see Salfeld, *l. c.*, 4-6) are no more significant than similar Midrashic utilization of the rest of the Bible, it is more reasonable to assume that they represent that tendency which subsequently became the only legitimate explanation of Shir ha-Shirim.

<sup>5</sup> M. Yadaim 3.5.

<sup>6</sup> Aboth de'Rabbi Nathan, s. v. הוּוּ סְתוּמִים בְּרִין (ed. Schechter, 2 and ב).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. his tract "de allegoria et historia contra Origenem ad Cerdonem," apud Baumstark, *Geschichte d. syrischen Literatur*, 103 and note 17.

enjoyed the greatest authority as exegete,<sup>8</sup> refused to recognize the sanctity of the Song, and denied categorically that it was prophetic in character, since the divine name does not occur in it even once.<sup>9</sup> He contended that it was a poem composed by King Solomon in honor and vindication of the black daughter of Pharaoh whom he had married, because the fair maidens of Jerusalem disparaged her for her color.<sup>10</sup> In this attitude he had his supporters and followers,<sup>11</sup> as is borne out by Christian fathers before and after his time.<sup>12</sup> Among Jews also the opinion existed that the literal meaning of the text is the correct meaning. The author of the Commentary which is the subject of this paper recounts in the Epilogue that the Jewish physician Abu-l-Ḥasan Meir ben Kamniel, a friend of Judah ha-Levi,<sup>13</sup> came to visit the Almoravide king, 'Ali ibn Yūsuf ibn Tashifin<sup>14</sup> at Marrakesh. There he found another doctor, whose name our author forgot,<sup>15</sup> who was expounding the Song of Songs to the king according to its plain meaning. Ibn Kamniel was outraged by the action of the "stupid, ignorant physician", and succeeded in persuading the king that the reputation of its author, Sulaimān ibn Dāwud,

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Ṭṣō'dad of Merw (ca. 850), "Kommentar zum Hohenlied" (ed. Euringer, in *Oriens Christianus*, 3rd series, VII, 49–74), 52: טובנא ניר מפשקנא עם שלהבתיה בך עקבתה, כלחון רר"י בעקבתה, the reference being to Theodore. Cf. also Baumstark, *l. c.*, 102–103; Riedel, *l. c.*, 85.

<sup>9</sup> שלהבתיה is rendered *φλόγες αὐτῆς* by LXX; Pesh. שלהבתיה.

<sup>10</sup> See the Acts of the 5th ecumenical Synod which excommunicated him, as excerpted in Riedel, *l. c.*, 80 sqq.; Ṭṣō'dad, *l. c.*, 52; Barhebraeus, *Anmerkungen zu den Salomonischen Schriften* (ed. Rahlfs), 21.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Ṭṣō'dad above, note 8. Riedel points out (*l. c.* 86) that the Ethiopian Church (monophysite) has adopted the attitude of the Nestorians.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Gregorius Nyssae, "In Cantica Canticorum", Migne, *PG*, XLIV, 755–756; Theodoret, Bishop of Cyr, *PG*, LXXXI, 29–30.

<sup>13</sup> On ibn Kamniel (or Kamaniel, see *Zion*, I [1936], 19 note 36) see Schirmann, "חיי יהודה הלוי", *Tarbīz*, 9 (1938), 51–2. His importance is attested by the honorific title אלוליל אלויל, and Schirmann reasons that he probably gained influence at the court of 'Ali ibn Tashifin in Marrakesh, where he settled prior to 1130. Cf. also Baer, *תולדות היהודים בספרד*, 312 (note 36).

<sup>14</sup> 1128–1143, Zambaur, *Manuel de Généalogie et de Chronologie*, 73.

<sup>15</sup> From a reference in Maimonides' work on asthma (על הקצרה), ed. Muntnier, 43 ([ק"ט]), we may perhaps be right in assuming that it was Abu Ayyūb Solomon b. al-Mu'allim of Seville, likewise a friend of ha-Levi. See Schirmann, *ib.*, note 60.



ruled out any such understanding of the tract.<sup>16</sup> A possibly authentic opinion of the Sages, recorded in a fourteenth-century Midrash, declares that it is permissible to teach ordinary people the simple meaning of the Song (על פשטיה),<sup>17</sup> and a fourteenth-century commentary, of Franco-German provenance, confines itself to just such a literal, erotic interpretation.<sup>18</sup> Another work, of about the same region and period, also follows the same approach.<sup>18a</sup> Joseph Kimḥi protests vigorously against a commentator who took the Song to be a love-poem.<sup>19</sup> A Kabbalistic exposition by Rabbi Ezra, wrongly ascribed to Nahmanides, knows of three approaches to the book, and identifies the first as the one which regards its text as "words of love, enchantment and foolish vanity and nonsense".<sup>20</sup>

There can be no doubt, however, that the allegorical interpretation of Shir ha-Shirim (שה"ש) became authoritative and almost universally accepted. Rabbi Akiba's staunch defense of its sacred character most probably coincided with a widespread

<sup>16</sup> F. 126b-127a. "אלטביב אלנאהל אלנבי". For this and other reasons, ibn Hāzīm, *Al-Milal wal-Nihāl*, I, 207-208, rejects the belief that Solomon is its author.

<sup>17</sup> See Michael Friedlander, "פירוש שיר השירים" in *Steinschneider Festschrift*, 53: וחכמים אומ' מותר לקרות שיר השירים על פשטיה ואין מורין בו דבר חכמה אלא לדיון או לראש העיר. The full meaning of this dictum will be realized in connection with the remainder of the passage below, p. 394. It should be noted, however, that in the light of this meaning the expression על פשטיה can hardly have the sense of an erotic interpretation. The emphasis is clearly on the injunction.

<sup>18</sup> *Steinschneider Festschrift*, 164-185. The extant portion lacks the introduction. It is possible that the commentator meant this to be one of several explanations, as ibn Ezra does in his exposition.

<sup>18a</sup> It was published by Hübsch, *Die Fünf Megilloth* (חמש מגילות עם הרמזים) (פורי המכונה פשיטא) see p. XII-XIII. Although the author takes notice of the Midrashic interpretation (see ad 1. 1), he limits his explanation to the literal meaning only.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. his introduction *apud* Salfeld, *l. c.*, 52 note 6.

<sup>20</sup> Ed. Altona, Introd. 46: הכת האחת לא הבינה ולא השכילה ורבים חללים הפילה. באמרם כי דבריו דברי חשק וקסם ואלילי הבל ואין בהם מועיל. . . ואם היה כדבריהם לא נכתב בתוך כתבי הקדש ולא נמנה עמהם. As quoted by R. Jacob of Lissa in the introd. to his Commentary (מקראות גדולות, הוצ' ראם, 1924), 416: אמנם הרמב"ן בהקדמתו לפירוש שיר השירים כתב שיש אפיקורסים אשר נקשרו בתאות עולם הזה ולקחו אותו על פשטיותה ועשו ממנו שיר ענבים ימח שמם עכ"ל הרמב"ן.

feeling that it was an inspired work. Rabbi Akiba may have expressed his own profound admiration of it when he exclaimed: All of time is not as worthy as the day on which Shir ha-Shirim was given to Israel, for all the כתובים are holy, but שיר השירים is the holiest of holies.<sup>21</sup> But in the general sentiment voiced he undoubtedly spoke for the vast majority. This is evident from the almost unanimous practice of expositors throughout the centuries. The Song of Songs was henceforth regarded as a holy allegory in which the lover represents God and the shepherdess is Israel. Not unnaturally, an idyllic rather than a realistic exposition was favored.<sup>22</sup> In this vein, probably the oldest, and certainly the most integrated Midrash is the Aramaic Targum.<sup>23</sup> In fairly good chronological order,<sup>24</sup> it traces the history of Israel from the Exodus through the destruction of the second Temple. It devotes the larger portion of its exposition to the happier periods in Jewish history, when the people were faithful to God and He bestowed His favor upon them.<sup>25</sup> Even Israel's backsliding and punishment are mitigated through the emphasis laid on their repentance and their quest of God. The last portion of the Targum describes the Messianic age in passages filled with pathos and a passionate yearning for redemption. The various Midrashim<sup>26</sup> also follow this general outline, except that co-

<sup>21</sup> M. Yadaim 3.5. עולם as time is much more appropriate here than as world. See the forced explanation of תפארת ישראל, ad loc.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Rabbi Judah's reprimand to Rabbi Meir: דייך מאיר אין דורשין שיר השירים, *Shir ha-Shirim Rabbah* ad 1.12 and 2.4.

<sup>23</sup> See Salfeld, *l. c.*, 7-12; Riedel, *l. c.*, 6-8; Liebreich, "The Benedictory Formula in the Targum to the Song of Songs" (*HUCA*, XVIII [1944]), 177-179. For a Hebrew translation see Salfeld, 179 no. 129.

<sup>24</sup> Occasionally it shifts back and forth in its exposition, notably in ch. 1 where, e. g., after discussing Moses' death and his prediction in v. 8, it returns to the crossing of the Red Sea in v. 9. See also 8.11.

<sup>25</sup> From the beginning to 3.4 the verses are related to the Exodus through the Revelation on Mt. Sinai; 3.5 to 4.16 the conquest of Palestine and especially the erection of the Temple, to which the entire section save the first two verses are devoted; 5.1 to 7.12 deals with Israel's sin and punishment; the last portion of the book depicts the expectation and arrival of the Messiah.

<sup>26</sup> Such as שיר השירים זוטא; שיר השירים רבה (ed. Buber); אגרת שיר השירים (ed. Grünhut).

herence of exposition is notably wanting. Each verse is explained without regard to the context and with no attempt to develop a logical or chronological sequence,<sup>27</sup> and new motives, such as the adoration of Torah, are introduced. With the almost dominant figurative interpretation, the esteem of the Scroll rose very high. The Targum considers this Song superior to the nine others which were or will be recited in the world,<sup>28</sup> and Shir ha-Shirim Rabbah lauds it as המעולה שבשירים, המסולסל שבשירים.<sup>29</sup>

It may well be that the reverence in which שה"ש was held led to the development of an esoteric approach. A Yemenite philosophic commentary on the work, no later than the fourteenth century,<sup>30</sup> after offering its explanation of 1.2a, continues:<sup>31</sup> מעשה שדרש ר' עקיבה בשיר השירים וכשהגיע לפיסוק ישקני מנשיקות פיהו בכה רבן גמליאל אמ' לו תלמידיו ר' למה בכית אמ' מפני שאין דורשין במעשה שה"ש בייחוד. מרכבה אפילו בייחוד.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Heinemann, *l. c.*, 60 ff. Cf. Rashi ad Song 2.7, s. v. ואם תעוררו.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Targum right at the beginning: עשרתי שירתא אהאמרו בעלמא הדין שירא דין משבח מן כלחון. See Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, VI, 11, note 59; Churgin "שירת אברהם אבינו" (in *נבעת שאול*, ed. Regensberg) 94; Epstein, "תרגום שיר השירים" (in *מסורה ומעשר*, I, 85-9; Buter, *שיר שה"ש*, 9 and n. 32. For Christian lists of the ten songs see Riedel, *l. c.*, 116 ff., to which may be added Philo of Carpasia's list, *PG*, 40, 29 f.

<sup>29</sup> Ad 1.1. For the development of the textual variant out of the probably original קדש כל השירים קדש cf. Lieberman, *תוספת ראשונים*, II, 8 n. 1. It affords an interesting illustration of the growing admiration of the book. The comparison with the שירים has undoubtedly caused later writers some embarrassment. Moses ibn Tibbon (Comm. p. 9), Gersonides (Comm. 5 c) and Sforino ad 1.1 explain the שירים קדש כי מאלו השירים אשר לשלמה קדש דבר בזה הפסוק; see also the comment of שפתי חכמים on Rashi to the verse. An instructive variation R. Eleazar b. Azaria's parable, as reported Shir Rabbah I, 11; Tanhūma, תצוה, 5; Yalkūṭ Shir 980, is found in Shir Ha-Shirim Zūṭa, 1 (p. 9): למלך שנתן לנחמיה כור חטים ואמר לו הוצא לי משם עשר סאין סולת. חור: (9): ואמר לו [הוצא לי] מתוך עשר שש מתוך שש ארבע כך הקב"ה סולת את הנביאים מתוך התורה ואח הכתובים מתוך הנביאים ושיר השירים נסלחה מכולם.

<sup>30</sup> The extant fragment (1.1-1.10) was published by Friedlander (see note 17). According to its editor (*Kaufmann Memorial Volume*, 1 ff. [Hebrew]), the MS. of which our text forms part is an autograph of about 1323. Steinschneider suggests the 13th century (*Arab. Liter. d. Juden*, 292).

<sup>31</sup> 52 f. The comment on this verse also contains the passage cited above note 17.



with מעשה מרכבה finds peculiar confirmation in a report by the third-century Christian father Origen that among the Jews no one is permitted to take "this book" in hand until he has reached full maturity. Furthermore, although the Rabbis give instruction to the young in the entire Bible and Mishna, they shun the following four items: "the beginning of Genesis, in which the creation is described; the beginning of Ezekiel, in which the Cherubim are discussed; the end [of Ezekiel], which contains the [re]building of the Temple; and this book of the Song of Songs"<sup>32</sup> Clement of Alexandria also confirms this report.<sup>33</sup>

Professors Marmorstein and Lieberman have independently suggested one explanation for the Jewish injunction against the reading of שה"ש.<sup>34</sup> The previously mentioned Yemenite fragment, in its comment on the same verse (1.2), also reports this: ר' צדקיהו<sup>35</sup> אומר' למה הוא דומה קורא שיר השירים בזמן הזה למלך שקישטו לו כלה בתכשיטין באת שפחה והרגתה ולבשה תכשיטה כשבא המלך להורקק לה מצאה שפחה אמר לה ומי הביאך לכאן אמרה אל תפתח פה לשטן שאני היא כלה. Both scholars argue that once the Christian Church adopted the allegoric interpretation of שה"ש, applying it to the relation between Jesus and the Church,<sup>36</sup> the Jews avoided it and preferred to leave it unexplained.<sup>37</sup> This highly plausible reasoning does not, however, exclude the possibility of the existence of a

<sup>32</sup> *Commentarius in Canticum Canticorum*, Prologus (*Origenes Werke*, XIII, Leipzig 1925, 62 [Lommatsch XIV, 289–290]). Jerome does not count שה"ש among the items which may not be read before the age of 30. *Epistula LIII*, (ed. Hilberg, I, 461)

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Marmorstein, "Deux Renseignements d'Origène concernant les Juifs" (*REJ*, 71, 191–199), 195 note 1.

<sup>34</sup> Marmorstein, *l. c.*, 196 sqq.; Lieberman, מדרשי חסן, 13–17 esp. 14 ff.

<sup>35</sup> On the worthlessness of the significance of the name in this and other Yemenite Midrashim see Lieberman, *l. c.*, 14, 19, 23 and 39.

<sup>36</sup> Riedel, *l. c.*, 50 notes that the polemical tenor of the allegorization in Hippolytus, the first Christian commentator, "scheint mir noch darauf hinzuweisen, dass die Deutung auf die christliche Kirche an die jüdische Deutung auf das Volk Israel angeknüpft hat". See also p. 51, and cf. Euringer, *l. c.*, 50.

<sup>37</sup> Lieberman, *ib.*, contends that the reported prohibition against the study of the last chapter of Ezekiel also resulted from the Christian appropriation of the concept of מלך של מעלה, as previously argued by Aptowitzer (*Tarbiz*, II, 270 ff.), and disagrees with Marmorstein's conjecture that Jews refused to read it because it hurt their pride, reminding them of their weakness.

more philosophic or mystic approach to the Song than the accepted allegoric method. Indeed, the fact that the Yemenite commentary and Origen link the exposition of ש"ש with מעשה מרכבה and מראה בראשית seems to argue for this assumption.<sup>38</sup> Moreover, the popularity of the allegoric method among Alexandrian Jewish authors, and its prevalence among the Essenes in Palestine, make it even more credible.<sup>38a</sup>

Be that as it may, although the allegoric exposition of ש"ש became dominant, and numerous commentaries down to our own time have all read in it the story of the relation between God and Israel, the philosophic view eventually had its day. It came from the impact of Hellenized Islam on Jewish culture, which affected Biblical exegesis as it did many other spheres of Jewish literary activity. The intellectual atmosphere favored the development of individualism, which was given expression in a personal lyric poetry such as had not previously existed in the Diaspora, and in a new emphasis on the central position of the individual in the realm of theology and creed. The Song of Songs appeared to be beautifully suited for the new trend.

The spiritual father of the group of commentators who substituted the individual for the nation as the theme of the allegory is Maimonides.<sup>39</sup> His predilection for the philosophic and mystic view of the Song, as well as a similar tendency with respect to other books of the Bible,<sup>40</sup> is quite evident in his works. In both the Code and the Guide, he makes it clear, either through the

<sup>38</sup> Although the evidence of the Yemenite alone would not be sufficient, since it may be ex post facto resulting from the philosophic activity of the twelfth and following centuries, its agreement with Origen lends it authenticity. The skepticism of Graetz (*Schir Ha-Schirim*, 117) regarding Origen's statement is not justified. לא ראינו אינה ראיה.

<sup>38a</sup> For the tendency of Alexandrian Jewry see Stein, *פילון האלכסנדרוני*, 182-185; Wolfson, *Philo*, I, 87-143 esp. 115 ff. and 55-73. For the use of allegory among the Essenes see Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, III, 2, 236 ff.

<sup>39</sup> Despite the popularity of the individualistic motive among Christian exegetes (Origen, who emphasized this interpretation in his commentary, was followed by many others until modern times) it is very unlikely that the Jewish interest in Muslim Spain came from this outer stimulus.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Bacher, *Die Bibeldexegese Moses Maimunis*, 8-17. On his alleged authorship of פרקי הצלחה and its allegoric interpretation of Ps. 45, see Davidowitz-Baneth, *פרקים בהצלחה*, VII-IX and XIV-XXII.

explanation of a verse or by a general statement, that ש"ש deals with the relation between God and man or, as he expresses the objective more philosophically in the Guide,<sup>41</sup> between the active intellect and the soul. In the chapters on penitence in the Code, he writes: "What is the proper love [of God]? That man love God with a great, overwhelming and burning love . . . as if he were sick with love-sickness . . . This is what Solomon meant in saying metaphorically 'For I am love-sick'. All of the Song of Songs is an allegory for this subject",<sup>42</sup> And in the last chapter of the Guide, in describing "real human perfection", he admonishes man and addresses him as "you who forget your soul until her fairness of face is darkened because the physical faculties have gained sway over her, as is stated at the beginning of those poetical allegories which deal with this theme: 'My mother's sons were incensed against me, they made me keeper of the vineyards, but mine own vineyard have I not kept' ".<sup>43</sup>

Maimonides' spiritualization of the inner meaning of ש"ש found ready acceptance in those circles in which philosophy became the adored mistress. Those disciples of the Master who were so zealous in converting the Bible into a philosophic encyclopedia were undoubtedly fortified in their view of the purport of the Song of Songs by Maimonides' several references to it. Moses ibn Tibbon acknowledges that in his commentary he follows the great master.<sup>44</sup> Joseph ibn Caspi disclaims originality in his interpretation and tells us that "the Luminary who lit the world opened our eyes to it".<sup>45</sup> Taking his cue from

<sup>41</sup> Moreh 3.51 (ed. Munk 126b; ed. Wilno, III, 66a): אלאמאאל אלשעריה (במשלים השיריים אשר נשאו לאלו העניינים) אלתי צרבת להדה אלמעאני, i.e., the relations between the Active Intellect and the soul.

<sup>42</sup> הלכות תשובה, 10.3.

<sup>43</sup> 3.54 (ed. Munk 134a; ed. Wilno 70b).

<sup>44</sup> ואני משה ב"ר שמואל ב"ר יהודה בן תבון מרמון ספרד: 1874, 6: פירוש על שיר השירים בראותי המנלה יקרה מאד וגדולה . . . אמרתי אל לבי לכתוב מה שנראה לי בה מחדש נמשך בפירושה אחר מה שפירש הרב המורה בפסוקים ממנה ואשר הרחיב בהם אבא מרי מ"כ Salfeld's indecision as regards Samuel ibn Tibbon's treatment of ש"ש (*l. c.*, 85–86) rests on a misunderstanding of the passage in Moses' work 12, top.

<sup>45</sup> In his introduction (שלושה פירושים), ed. Akrish, 1b) he states: וגם זאת הכוונה הכוללה לא מלבי כי המאור המאיר לארץ האיר עינינו בזה כשהודיענו זה ובפרט פרק נ"א משלישי ודי בו באותו רמז לנו ולדומה לנו



Maimonides regarding the classification of the allegories from a philosophic point of view, he characterizes ש"ש as belonging to the second class; the general theme of the book is to be understood philosophically, but much of its contents serves no purpose other than that of embellishing the story.<sup>46</sup> Levi ben Gerson contends that, unlike the general practice of the Bible to teach its lesson in such fashion that the masses will learn proper behavior, and the chosen few will attain intellectual perfection, "this book guides the chosen few only towards the means of attaining happiness, and for this reason its exoteric garb was not selected with the aim of benefiting the common people".<sup>47</sup> Philosophy scored a clean victory over many of Maimonides' disciples, and the Midrashic exposition, with its emphasis on national history and hopes, did not satisfy them. Gersonides respectfully but firmly rejects the pertinence of the Midrashic method to this book, and insists that only the "true meaning" may be extracted from it.<sup>48</sup> But Immanuel of Rome speaks insolently of the Rabbinic exposition and dismisses it as the expression of those who are dominated by the perceptual soul.<sup>49</sup> Not unjustly a later commentator upbraids the author of this

<sup>46</sup> Ib.: לכן אומר שאין ספק אצלי שזה הספר הוא מן המין השני מן המשלים שזכר המורה ז"ל בהחלת ספרו שאין כל מלה יש במשל לענין במשל כמו שהוא הענין באותה הפרשה שזכר, ואולם זה הספר והוא שיר השירים מיישר היחידים לבד אל דרך הנעת ההצלחה, ולזה

<sup>47</sup> Introduction, 3c. See also 3b. לא הושם נלחו מעל להטמן

<sup>48</sup> Ib., 2a: אבל ראינו כל הביאורים אשר ביארו בה הקודמים ממי שהגיעו אלינו דבריהם: הולכים מהלך הדרשים ובכלל מהלך מה שיאמר בו בדברים חלוף מה שכוון בהם. ואלו הדברים ואם הם טובים בעצמם אין ראוי שיושמו ביאורים לדברים אשר נאמרו עליהם על צד הדרש. ולזה אין ראוי למי שירצה לבאר הענינים האלו ודומיהם שימשכו אל הדרשים אשר נאמרו עליהם אבל ישחדל לבד לבארם כפי כוונתם.

<sup>49</sup> Eschwege, *Der Kommentar des Immanuel . . . zum Hohenliede*, 1: אומר כי: הספר הזה על דעת רז"ל הוא סבחר הספרים שנאמרו ברוח הקדש ונחלקו המפרשים בביאורו . . . כי קצתם והם אומרים שלא נפרדו מהמורשת והתכלית אשר אליו עיניהם נשואות וכלות אליו כל היום הוא יקר העולם הזה ותפארתו והנמול הנדול אשר אליו ייחלון חלף עבודתם ומשכורתם מאת האלהים הוא שובם לנדולתם אל ארץ זבת חלב ודבש ולמלאות כריסים מבשר ליתן ומוחם מן היין המשומר בענביו יפרשו הספר הזה הנכבד שידבר בספור מעשה האבות ודרתם למצרים וצאתם משם ביד חזקה ובזרוע נטויה וקבולם התורה ובואם אל ארץ זבת חלב ודבש ועמידת ישראל בארץ וגלותם ממנו ושובם אל הארץ בבנין בית שני וגלותם משם שנית והנאולה (בכתי' והנמולה) העתידה. יחשבו שיהיה הספר הזה שהוא קודש קדשים כאחד הספרים ההמוניים וכספרי דברי הימים אשר לאחד מן המלכים אשר תועלתם מועתת והקריאה בהם אבוד זמן.

otherwise commendable exposition for insulting and maligning all those who see in it an allegory of the fate of the nation.<sup>50</sup>

Joseph ben Judah ibn 'Aḳnīn, who claims to be the first to have compiled a philosophic commentary on the Song of Songs, with the title *The Revelation of the Secrets and the Appearance of the Lights*,<sup>51</sup> is almost certainly not indebted to Maimonides for his method of exegesis or its results. His work seems not to have a single basic idea borrowed from the Sage,<sup>52</sup> and except for two irrelevant references,<sup>53</sup> his name is not mentioned in the entire book. The divergence between the two men in the treatment of certain Biblical problems<sup>54</sup> also leads to the same conclusion. Moreover, on one occasion, after a highly symbolized interpretation of Jacob's struggle with the angel,<sup>55</sup> the author continues: "After we interpreted esoterically what became clear

<sup>50</sup> David Provenzale (quoted Salfeld, *l. c.*, 91 note 1): אמנם הלונתי גדולה על החבר ר' עמנואל אשר בזה וחרף ונדרף המפרשים ספר שיר השירים הזה על דבוק האומה באלהיה ונלותה ונאולתה ושובה באחרית הימים.

<sup>51</sup> F. 4b: "... As for this interpretation (i. e. the third, which is philosophic, see below) we have not discovered among the predecessors any one who anticipated us in it or suggested any of it in the slightest. We gave it the last place because those (the first and second) preceded chronologically, whereas the third explanation follows them in accordance with the lateness of our age with respect to them. Moreover, the view of our Rabbis is that the last one receives a reward equivalent to the total of the others (האחרון כלם נוסל שכר כנגד כלם)." — Cf. ibn 'Aḳnīn *ספר המוסר* (ed. Bacher), 153<sup>28</sup> and 207 — The Arabic title of the work is: *אנושאף אל אסראר ופחור אל אנואר*.

<sup>52</sup> Steinschneider's assertion to the contrary is unwarranted. The principles of psychology which our author and Maimonides hold in common were borrowed by both from al-Fārābī, and the Aristotelian-neo-Platonic view of the world was common property. If ibn 'Aḳnīn's claim in the preceding note is correct, Maimonides did not even inspire the approach. The chronology, as will be pointed out, will confirm this conclusion.

<sup>53</sup> See below.

<sup>54</sup> Whereas our author renders Ex. 23.21, 22 symbolically as an injunction to the soul to follow the active intellect who is מלאך, so that המקום means the world-to-come, and obedience leading a life of virtue (f. 2a-b), Maim. (*Moreh*, II, 34) takes it in its plain meaning, insisting that the words are addressed to the masses. To our author כפי (Ex. 33.23, 24) means the body (48b), but to Maim. it stands for God's help (I, 21).

<sup>55</sup> Ff. 52-53 (which really are 32-3; hence Steinschneider [*l. c.* 59 and 64 note 1] and Neubauer, *Bodleian Catalogue* no. 396 [p. 75] both thought there was a lacuna here) and 32-34 [i. e. 34-36].

to us, with the aid of the light of the Creator Whom we thank and Whose name we sanctify which was bestowed upon us, of the inner sense of verses in the Bible, in our treatise on the *Hygiene of the Soul*, in the *Sefer ha-Musar*, and מעשה בראשית and חקים ומשפטים of our compendious volume entitled *Mishneh Torah* by . . . Moses bar . . . Maimon, and we found there his ruling as follows: Whoever perverts the sense of the Torah, or explains precepts other than literally is a liar, a wicked man and a heretic. The apparent meaning of his statement is that he enjoins esoteric interpretation . . . But on closer scrutiny it is evident that there is no disagreement between us".<sup>56</sup> He then goes on to reason that Maimonides would not disapprove of his procedure in which there is not the slightest intention to annul the literal meaning,<sup>57</sup> but only to derive more from the text. It is clear that at the time of this writing our author had had no occasion to become familiar with Maimonides' application of his own ruling, or he would have utilized the latter's method as the best argument that there was no disagreement between them.

The foregoing quotation leads to the conclusion that the works listed there were all composed before his commentary on ש"ה, and that their *terminus ad quem* is about 1180, the date of the compilation of the *Mishneh Torah*.<sup>58</sup> The work under dis-

ולמא פסרנא מן עלם אל באטן מא תבין לנא ממא פאץ מן נור אל בארי נשכרה ונקדם<sup>56</sup> אסמה ממא תבין לנא פי מעאני בואטן פסוקים מן אל ארבעה ועשרים פי מקאלה טב אל נפוס ופי ספר המוסר ופי מעשה בראשית ומעשה מרכבה מן תאליפנא אל כביר אל מסמי חקים ומשפטים בלננא אלתאליף אל שריף אל מסמי משנה תורה למופת הזמן ר' משה בר כבוד החכם רבינו מימון ז"ל פונדנא פיה כלאטא הדא נצה המנלה פנים בתורה והמוציא דברי המצוות מפעטן הרי זה בראי רשע ואפיקורוס (פי"א מה' מלכים בד"י) דל טאהר כלאמה עלי תהרים F. 34a תאוילאת אל בואטן . . . פלחעלמוא אן תעקב אלנטר תבין אן לים ביננא כלאף אצלא [36a].

<sup>57</sup> That Maimonides foresaw correctly the danger of unbridled allegorization is evident from later developments. See Kaufmann, *Zunz Jubelschrift*, 143-148 and the Hebrew text, 142-174. Cf. also Tanhūm Yerushalmi's commentary on Jonah (ed. Kokowzoff), 104.

<sup>58</sup> The *Mishneh Torah* is not mentioned by ibn 'Aqñin in his *Tibb al-Nufūs* (where no writing of Maimonides is invoked) or the המוסר. Bacher, editor of latter, lists several passages in it which he identifies as borrowings from the Code (p. XV), but most of them are not necessarily taken from



cussion cannot be dated exactly. His desire to reconcile his views with Maimonides' ruling was expressed at the particular place in his exposition because it was preceded by a rendering of the law of הנשה ניר which at first glance seems to subvert its prescriptive force, and does not fix its time of writing. True, in his discussion of 5.6 he declares in the name of the people of Israel: From that time on (i. e., the destruction of the second Temple), I have been pleading and supplicating Him, but He has not responded for as long as the Exile which has lasted more than 1100 years.<sup>59</sup> But while this date establishes the *terminus a quo*, it gives only an approximate indication of the year of composition.

On the other hand, the place of writing, as scholars have recognized,<sup>60</sup> can be definitely stated to have been the Maghreb (Fez). In the Epilogue to his work he prays: "I hope that My Lord will grant me a handsome reward and will aid me in my desire to cleanse myself from the defilement of conversion by helping me in my plan to break away from 'the land of the decree which has not been cleansed'".<sup>61</sup> The Rabbis have taught: When a person attempts to cleanse himself he is aided. Since I aim to cleanse myself, and have performed a major מצוה in writing a commentary on this book which is called the holiest of holies, may God give me my reward and help me to attain the other major מצוה".<sup>62</sup> Obviously he resided in a land where he was

there, and the other two or three may be later interpolations, just as the many cross-references from our book to the others can obviously be accounted for only as later insertions.

<sup>59</sup> F. 70b: פסן חנינד אנא פי אלרנבה ואל תצרע אליה פלם יניבני פי מרה דהה אל גלות סנה (71b): שומרי החומות ואלהי תמארי טאלע עלי אלף ומאיה סנה פאן כל אמה הסתולי עליה (יעני כנסת ישראל) הטלב סנהא אל דכול פי נואמיסהא ואן תכרנ ען אלכלל ועלי מא עלם מן מלכות ישמעאל ואדום מן מקצוד כל ואחדה דהור ישראל ונסכחא.

<sup>60</sup> Steinschneider, *l. c.*, 69; Neubauer, *MGWJ*, 1870, 349 and 400.

<sup>61</sup> Ezek. 22.24. In translating "Land des Unheils", St. (*l. c.* 68) apparently missed the point.

<sup>62</sup> F. 129a: נרנא מן רבנא חסן אל חואב ואעאנתה לנא פי מא נרומה מן טהארה מן טמאט: השמר אן יבלונא אל אמל פי מקצדנא מן אל כדע מן ארץ מרה אשר לא מטהרהה היא וכמא קאלוא רבותינו ז"ל בא לטהר מסייעין אותו ולמא כאן אמלנא פי אלטהרהה ותקדם לנא פעל מצוה רבה בשרחנא הרא אלכתאב אלמסמי קדש קדשים אן יתן אלהים שכרי בלוננא להדה אל מצוה רבה אל אכרי.

compelled to conceal his true religion, if not to disavow it publicly.<sup>63</sup>

It is not known whether ibn 'Aḳnīn achieved his desire and left the country. Any attempt to answer this question inevitably raises the problem of his relations with Maimonides. The debate as to whether or not the author of the commentary on ש"ה and of the other works is identical with the celebrated and favorite pupil of the author of the Guide is over 100 years old,<sup>64</sup> but it is not settled yet.<sup>65</sup> In this paper we deal with the matter only in so far as it pertains to our problem, without going into all the pros and cons. Since we know how eager ibn 'Aḳnīn was to escape from the Maghreb, it is tempting to believe that his efforts were rewarded. Some texts which report the departure from that district to the East of a scholar by the name of Joseph ben Judah ibn Simeon might seem reasonably to fit our Joseph

<sup>63</sup> It is a moot question whether he, or Maimonides, were actually obliged to profess Islam outwardly. The language of the prayer would seem to indicate that at least in ibn 'Aḳnīn's case ש"ה was a necessity. Cf. also his Midrashic interpretation ad 7.1 (93a-b): (כ"י לכמאלה) (כ"י לכמאלה) פבאן נואב אל מלה אני לכמאלה (כ"י לכמאלה) אל פצל האבעה לטאעהך ואן כנה (כ"י כאנה) בין מחנים אראדהך (כ"י אראדהך) אנה ואראדה אל אמות מני פאנא אצמר אל טאעה לך דון אשהר ואטוהר טאעהכס כופא מנהם (The reply of the community is clear: I am perfect in excellence, obedient to your command. Although I am between two camps, [i. e.] Your will and what the nation demand of me, I conceal my obedience to You, not exhibiting it, and I feign obedience to them for fear of them).

<sup>64</sup> Munk wrote his biography of Joseph ben Judah ibn Shim'on in 1842 (*Journal asiatique*, 3 series, vol. 14, 5-70), and in it (p. 8 ff.) he decides against identifying him with our author. Steinschneider expressed his disagreement with Munk in the review of the latter's monograph (1845), mentioning Dukes and Geiger as supporters of identification (*l. c.*, 583 f.). In his own biography of ibn 'Aḳnīn (1855; *l. c.*, 35-73) he elaborated his view. Various scholars have taken sides since then one way or the other. It is puzzling that whereas St. asserts that Munk changed his mind and granted the identity (*l. c.* 76 and 82 note 1), later scholars continue to number him among the opponents. B. D. Lewis considers Munk an original protagonist of the identification! (הש"ה, מצודה, 178).

<sup>65</sup> Baneth, הש"ה, אנרות הרמב"ם — חליפת המכתבים עם ר' יוסף בן יהודה, decides against their identity (והיה מחבריו של הרמב"ם באפריקה וממערציו אבל לא מתלמידיו) (p. 1), but he leaves his proof for another occasion. Lewis decides without difficulty that there were two, and that ibn 'Aḳnīn was the disciple.

ben Judah ibn 'Aḳnīn.<sup>66</sup> Ibn al-Ḳiftī, the Muslim friend of the fortunate *émigré*, even mentions some details which might seem to supplement the knowledge gained from the foregoing prayer.<sup>67</sup> But a good deal of the information in this source militates against the utilization of the helpful material. Ibn al-Ḳiftī states unequivocally that the escaped scholar studied with Maimonides, and it is difficult to conceive of our author as the student whom we know from the correspondence between him and his teacher.<sup>68</sup> When we consider that prior to 1180 he had written three major books,<sup>69</sup> we are forced to the conclusion that he was not much younger, if at all, than Maimonides.<sup>69a</sup> Moreover, a passage in our commentary incontrovertibly refutes the assumption that he was the latter's disciple. In the course of his Midrashic exposition of 7.14, he declares: "Her [i. e., the community of Israel] assertion לך צפנתי refers to the period of forcible conversion during which we fulfill the precepts of the Law at the point of the sword, and particularly this persecution of ours, may the Lord put an end to it. Yet, as is well known, we steadily engage in the study of Torah. The clearest proof of our statement is the presence in our age of the great sage . . . Moses . . . son of . . . Maimon in Fez, whose rank in learning is unique,<sup>70</sup> and whose works testify to his learning, to wit: the *Commentary on the Mishna*, the *Mishneh Torah*, the *Sefer ha-Miṣwoth* and the *Guide*

<sup>66</sup> Ḳiftī, *Ta'rikh al-ḥukamā'* (ed. Lippert), 312–315; al-Ḥarizī, תחכמוני, 50 (ed. Lagarde 41–82 [p. 203–204]). It is known that אבן שמעון does not occur in his genealogy, although, as Ḳiftī states (312), it is clearly the *nisba* of Maimonides' disciple, cf. Abraham Maimonides, 'הלכות ה', Wilno, 4a.

<sup>67</sup> Ib. כהם דינה ורחיל ענד אטכאנה מן אלהרכה פי אלאנתקאל אלי אלאקלים אלטצרי . . . והם לה דלך פארתחל במאלה ווצל אלי מצר (He concealed his religion, and when he was able to move about he contrived a plan to remove to the Egyptian zone. He realized it, set out with his wealth and arrived in Egypt).

<sup>68</sup> Ḳiftī, ib., also seems to indicate that his friend married for the first time when he came to Aleppo, which is unlikely for ibn 'Aḳnīn in view of his probable age.

<sup>69</sup> See above and note 58.

<sup>69a</sup> Al'ami's illustration from the persecutions in the time of ibn 'Aknīn אנרת מוסר) כאשר נגזר בימי הה'ר יוסף נ' עכנין ז'ל בשנים קדמוניות (ed. Habermann), does not indicate that he distinguishes them from the previously mentioned oppression in Maimonides' time.

<sup>70</sup> Literally: his rank in learning in his [own] rank.



to the Perplexed,<sup>71</sup> 'and these four children he gave, etc.' (Dan. 1.17). This is in addition to the superiority which he enjoys in the various fields of science. If he were the only appropriate example during the persecution, it would be ample (proof)".<sup>72</sup> The author of this passage, a resident of the Maghreb, cannot evidently be the scholar of Syria and Irak for whom Maimonides composed the Guide.<sup>73</sup>

It can therefore be concluded that the commentary was written after 1185<sup>74</sup> and that at that time he was still in Fez. It is also possible that he eventually managed to flee from the West and to come to Egypt.<sup>75</sup>

<sup>71</sup> For the name דליל אל-האירין in place of the correct ... דלאלה cf. Steinschneider, *l. c.*, 89.

<sup>72</sup> F. 103b-104a: וקולחא צפנהי לך אשארה אלי דורות השמד אלדי נקים שראיע אל תורה תחת דבאב אל סוף ולא סימי שמדנא הדא המקום יבטלו ונתן פיה כמא עלם משתגליל בלמוד התורה וברהאן קולנא טהור החכם הנדול רבינו משה בר כבוד ר' מימון בפאס ומכאנה מן אלעלם מכאנה והואליפה תשהד עלי עלומה שרה אלמשנה ומשנה תורה וספר המצות ודליל אל האירין והילדים האלה ארבעתן (י) נתן וכו' מעמא לה מן אלתקדם פי פנון אלעלום. פלו לם ינבני אלא הו פי אל שמד לכפא.

<sup>73</sup> Steinschneider's argument that the inclusion of the *Moreh* is an interpolation either by the author himself or by a copyist (*l. c.*, 74 note 99) is, as Neubauer has pointed out (*l. c.*, 349 note 1), untenable because it is required for the verse he cites and is an integral part of the whole statement. Nor is his other objection ("dass es noch auffallender sei, Maimonides als in Fez erschienen zu bezeichnen und doch die später in Aegypten verfassten Werke anzuführen") real. Ibn 'Aknin lived in Fez, came to know Maimonides there, and hence speaks of his "appearance" there. It does not follow from this at all that he thought the works were written there too. St.'s rebuttal, 80-81, is not convincing.

<sup>74</sup> Returning to the originally accepted date for the completion of the *Moreh*, which Diesendruck defends *HUCA*, XII-XIII, 461-497.

<sup>75</sup> This purely conjectural possibility is suggested on the basis of a reference by Kifti, *l. c.*, 167 to Yūsuf al-Nāṣī (i. e., הנשיא; read al-Fāṣī with ibn Abi Uṣāibi'a, 'Uyūn al-Anbā', II, 91) the Israelite, resident of Aleppo. The details are the same as those of Maimonides' disciple. But the fact that no mention is made at this point to the friendship which existed between them may perhaps indicate that it is another person. Furthermore, Yūsuf's knowledge of ibn Haitham's biography, of which Kifti reported, can be credited to ibn 'Aknin in view of the latter's recommendation of ibn Haitham as required reading, see St., *l. c.*, 78 and cf. Güdemann, *Das jüdische Unterrichtswesen*, 1873, 30 (Arabic): ויאמר מא פיהא האליף לבן אלהיהם יחתי עלי למאניה מלדאת (In Eppenstein's Hebrew translation [ספר היובל לסאקאלאון] this section is missing).

At the same time there is no reason to doubt that while Maimonides lived in Fez, he and ibn 'Aḡnīn knew each other. We learn this from a passage in his comment on 8.6. In his discussion of the phrase "set me as a seal", he explains that the soul desires to be *on* the heart and the arm rather than *in* the heart of the Active Intellect, because in the latter case he would control her and take her from the body when his love became intense. To illustrate it, he relates<sup>76</sup> "When the peer of the age, the defender of the Law with the swords of strong proof,<sup>77</sup> Rabbi Moses son of . . . Rabbi Maimon departed, we recited the following couplets:

נרדוד שכח לבבי את נותו	בעת נסע ידיד לבי ברכבי <sup>78</sup>
ונפשי יצאה עמו בצאתו	ואיך יכון לעורר אהבתו

Incidentally, the little poem also argues against the identification of the two individuals. For Maimonides writes to his disciple in his dedicatory epistle accompanying the Guide that he came to know him and his qualities through letters and poems which the latter had sent him.<sup>79</sup> It is very unlikely that Maimonides remained unaware of the calibre of his friend, or that he would make no reference to their former acquaintance and the opportunity he had had of knowing him.

As his efforts to deny any difference in point of view between Maimonides and himself demonstrate, he is eager to clear himself of any suspicion of unorthodoxy. Although he is very fond of the esoteric sense of the text which he undertakes to uncover, he, like others who were Judaizing non-Jewish culture, is careful to prove that he is not introducing unwarranted innovations. In his Epilogue he writes: "Perhaps some one who is weak in learning, deficient in discrimination, and of slight intelligence

פקלנא ענד פראק עלאמֶה אל זמן אלדאב ען אל שריעה בסיוף אל ברהאן ר' משה בר <sup>76</sup> F. 112a כבוד החכם ר' סימון בר עובדיה ה"ת (קרי: ר"ת = רוח ה' תניחני) הדה אל מקטועא

<sup>77</sup> This praise may also point to a time after the completion of the *Moreh* which is the strongest proof of the Law.

<sup>78</sup> Steinschneider, *l. c.*, 48 note 29 and Neubauer (*l. c.*, 395 note 1) erroneously read ברכני.

<sup>79</sup> Baneth, *l. c.*, 7.

will attack and blame me for utilizing philosophic statements, examples from the Arabic language and poetic stanzas".<sup>80</sup> He retorts by pointing to comparisons with Greek and other languages in Talmudic literature<sup>81</sup> and to R. Saadia's and R. Hai's employment of Arabic sources, including the *Qur'ān* and the *Ḥadīth*.<sup>82</sup> He relates on the authority of a letter containing the biography of R. Hai sent to Samuel ha-Nagid by R. Maṣliḥ ben al-Basak, *dayyān* of Sicily, that the Gaon once consulted the Christian Patriarch of Bagdad regarding the meaning of a Biblical passage.<sup>83</sup>

In the Introduction to the Commentary, ibn 'Aḡnīn derives his authority to read his interpretation into ש"ש from the action of the Rabbis. "It is inadmissible, he says,<sup>84</sup> that one of whom it is said 'Behold I have given thee a wise and an understanding heart' (I Kings 3.12)<sup>85</sup> . . . would compose a book in which he

<sup>80</sup> F. 127a: וּלְעַל טַעֲמֵן יִטְעֵן עֲלֵינוּ מִמֶּן הוּא צָעִיף אֶל עַלְמֵ דְרֵי אֲלֵחֲמִיין קָלִיל אֶל מַעְרַפָּה וַיִּנְקֵד פִּי מֵא אֲהִינָא בַּה פִּי שֶׁרָח הָדָא אֲלִכְתָּאב אֲלִשְׂרִיף מִן אַקוּאֵל אֲלִפְלֶאסְפָּה וּמִן אֲלֵלֶנָּה אֲלִעֲרַבִּיה וְאֲלֵאֲבִיאת אֲלִשְׁעֲרִיה.

<sup>81</sup> The examples he cites seem to have been copied almost verbatim from ibn Janāḥ; see *Kitāb al-Luma'*, 7 (ספר הרקמה, ed. Wilenski, 11). Cf. Steinschneider, *l. c.*, 67 note 84.

<sup>82</sup> Cf. Friedlander, *Der Sprachgebrauch des Maimonides*, I, X–XI and notes.

<sup>83</sup> The verse in question is Ps. 141.5, שֶׁמֶן רֹאשׁ אֶל יֵי רֹאשִׁי. The account goes on to relate that R. Hai likewise argued that the Rabbis had never hesitated to consult members of other faiths, "even shepherds of flocks and cattle". The incident is told by Steinschneider, *l. c.*, 67 note 87; Munk, *Journal asiatique*, 1862, II, 215. Harkavy לראשונים III, זכרון ר' שמואל (בן) (הפני וספריו), 49 note 126. For other fragments of R. Maṣliḥ's letter see B. Lewin, גנזי קדם, III, 67 ff. — Incidentally, Samuel b. Ḥofni's rendering of the Syriac ad Gen. 47.31 (Harkavy, *ib.* note 125; Israelsohn, *Tafsir* . . . *Samuel ben Hofni*, 122) is not עֲצָתָהּ עָלֵי עֲצָתָהּ, which is meaningless, but ואֲחָכָא.

<sup>84</sup> F. 1a: . . . וְלֵם יִנּוּ אֵיזָא עָלֵי (מֵא) [מִן] קָאֵל פִּיה תְּעִילִי הֵנָּה נִתְחִי לָךְ לֵב חֲסֵם וְגִבּוֹן . . . וְקִיל פִּיה וְיִחָסֵם מִכָּל הָאָדָם . . . אֵן יִצְעֵ כְּתָאבָא יִצְף פִּיה מִחֲאֹרָה וְצָף חֵב וְתִגְוִל בֵּין עֲאִשְׁק וּמַעֲשֻׁקָּה . . . וְלוֹ אֲנֻלָּא נֻוֵּא הָדָא עֲלִיהָ וְחִלְלִיהָ לִי מַעֲשֻׁת וְהָ לִנְוֹה רַבּוּ ז'ל כְּמֵא פַעֲלוּ בְּסִפֵּר רִפּוּאוֹת לְמֵא רָאוּ מֵא דְכָל מִן אֲנֻלָּה מִן אֲלִצְרֵר פְּכִיף בְּהָדָא אֲלֵדִי הוּא אַעֲטֵם צָרֵר מִן דְּלָךְ עָלֵי אֲלִשְׁבָּאן פִּלְמָא וְנִדְנָהֵם לֵם יִנְנוּ אַתּוּ . . . עֲלִמָּא אֲנָמָא אַקְצֵר אַכְרָזֵן מַעֲאֲנִי] הָ בְּהָדָה אֶל אֲלִפְאֶט לִיחֲבֵבָה לִלְנֻמִּיע . . . פִּאדָא שְׂדוּא קָלִילָא תִּפְכְּרוּא פִי עֻקוּלֵהִם אֵן לֹא יִנּוּ עָלֵי מַחֲאֵלָה (ם) ע'א'ס' אַנָּה קִצֵּר אֲלִטְאָהֵר מִן קִשּׁוֹר אֲלִפְאֶטָה . . . לִוְלָא אֵן לֵה בּוֹאֲטֵן שְׂרִיפָה

<sup>85</sup> For the exalted esteem in which Solomon was held see משנה תורה הלכות, 4.13 and *Moreh*, I, 59 (at the beginning). Ibn 'Aḡnīn explains II Samuel



described a dialogue consisting of songs of love and eroticism between a lover and his beloved . . . If we granted such a possibility,—and far be it from me to do so—our Rabbis would have suppressed it as they suppressed the *ספר רפואות* because they saw the harm that resulted from it.<sup>86</sup> How much more harmful this would be to young people! Since we find that they did not suppress it, . . . we know that his purpose in couching his idea in these words was to make it attractive to the masses . . . and when they became a little more learned they would reflect that it cannot be thought of the like of him that he intended the exoteric sense of the husk of the words . . . without noble mysteries . . .”

His deep respect for the ancients may have been one factor which influenced him to give a prominent place to the Midrashic interpretation. Throughout the commentary he follows the plan outlined in the Introduction of offering a threefold explanation. The first is a literal rendering in which he clarifies the meaning and etymology of the words, discusses their grammatical construction and inflection, and paraphrases the verse.<sup>87</sup> The second is the Midrashic allegorization, drawn from *מדרש חזית* and the Talmud.<sup>88</sup> Its basic postulate according to him is that “whatever is expressed in terms of arrival and love refers to the ages of redemption, such as the exodus from Egypt and others, and to what He will do for us in the Messianic age; what

12.25 to mean that Solomon was named *ידידה* because of God, i. e. he was called by the divine name *שלמה* because he was God's friend. F. 42b–43a. This explanation is quoted by Abraham b. Solomon in his commentary, Steinschneider, *l. c.*, 85. Cf. also *המוכר* 'ס', 83–4 and note (198) and *Tibb al-Nufūs* in Gudemann, *l. c.*, 45 (Arabic).

<sup>86</sup> See M. Pesāhim 4.9. For suggestions as to the probable nature of the *רפואות* see Maimonides' comm. ad loc. Regarding its authorship he says, *ib.*: . . . וּבְפִי שֶׁנֶּחֱדָה לִי כִּי חִיבַר שְׁלֹמֹה סֵפֶר רְפוּאוֹת . . . וּמִלְכָּד קִלְקוּל זֶה הַמַּאמֵר וְכו'. He is inclined to think that it resembled *Ṣabian* lore, cf. *Moreh*, III, 37 (ed. Wilno 50b; ed. Munk 83a); see also Munk's *Guide*, III, 292 note 1.

<sup>87</sup> F. 46: וְלֹא שָׂרַח אֲכָר אֵיזָא וְהוּא תַּפְסִירָה עָלֵי אֲלֶפֶשֶׁט וְתַפְסִיר סָא פִּיה מִן אֲשֶׁתְקָא. His authorities are Saadia, *ibn Ḥayyūj*, etc. He placed it first “because the exoteric precedes the esoteric” (*לאול סבב*) (אלפאחר ללבאטן).

<sup>88</sup> F. 46: וְאַלְשֶׁרֶם אֲלֵהֶאנִי מֵא דְהָבֹא אֵלֵיהָ רַבּוּ ז'ל פִּי אֲקֹאֵלֶהּ פִּי מִדְּרַשׁ חֲזִית וּמָא וְקַע פִּי דְלֶךְ. פִּי אֲלֵתְלִמּוֹד זְמַנָּהּ אֵיזָא וְרַתְבָּנָה.



their instruction in learning, their derivation of secondary from primary principles, and their elimination of doubts regarding them which may arise. For perfect knowledge in every speculative science consists of three stages: the acquisition of the knowledge of its roots; the capacity to extract all that follows from these roots, which bears on the science; the ability to counter the sophistry which develops in that science and to probe the views of other scholars so as to discriminate between true and false. This is a quotation from Abu Naṣr (al-Fārābī) from the beginning of his Book on Music'.<sup>95</sup> At times, he does the same thing even in the first part of his explanation. The first sentence of the comment on 6.4 reads: This is the beginning of the love song by the Active Intellect in praise of the rational soul.<sup>96</sup>

The hero of the Song is the Active Intellect and man's rational soul is the heroine.<sup>97</sup> The theme of the book is the mutual long-

אל אצול ורדהם ען אל שכור אל וארדה עליה. לאן כמאל אל עלם פי כל צנאעה נטריה אן תחצל לה פיהא אחואל חללה אולהא אסתיפא מערפה אצולהא ואלהאני אלקוה עלי אסתב[א]ט מא ילום ען חלך אל אצול מן מונודא חלך אל צנעה ואל חללה אלקוה עלי חלקי אל מנאלמאח אל וארדה עליה פי חלך אל עלם ואל קוה עלי כבאר ארי מן סואה מן אל נאטרין פיה וחכשף אל צואב מן סו אקאווילהא ואצלאח אל כלל עלי מא אכתל ראיח מנהם והדא נך כלאם אבו נצר. In a similar vein he finds the Rabbinic equation חורב שבעל פה—באר מים חיים appropriate, for just as well-water can be procured only with a pail, so the Oral Law can be achieved only by syllogisms and deductions and the employment of the reflective faculty, etc. F. 58a–b.

<sup>95</sup> Translated by d'Erlanger in *La Musique Arabe*, I, 2.

<sup>96</sup> F. 81b: *הדא אבהדא וצף מן אל פעאל פי מדה אל נאטקה*.

<sup>97</sup> For the purposes of this paper it is not necessary to discuss our author's psychological theory. Ibn 'Aknin, like Maimonides, is a thoroughgoing disciple of al-Fārābī. In the sections of his works where he deals with man's physiology and psychology, he either extracts passages from al-Fārābī (e. g., *Tibb al-Nufūs*, f. 5b–8b, which consists in the main of verbatim citations from *al-Madīna al-Fāḍila*, 34–37; note our author's concluding phrase *הדא הו* or paraphrases it, again with numerous quotations (43–49). In the latter summary (49) he refers to the selection in the *Tibb* and to his hitherto undiscovered *חקים ומשפטים*, in which he presumably copied al-Fārābī at even greater length (it extended over 12 chapters of *ספר עמודי החכמה* in the volume). A commendable presentation of al-Fārābī's theory of the soul will be found in Ibrahim Madkour, *La place d'al-Farabi dans l'école philosophique musulmane*, 122–209.

The following translation is offered as an illustration of our author's fond-



ing of the two for each other and the desire to unite, the love and respect which they feel towards each other, the anxiety for the welfare of the soul which the Active Intellect experiences and his eagerness to save her, the obstacles in the way of salvation and union, etc. The invitations which the lover extends to her to come with him, and his appearances to her are an indication of his love and his insistence that she join him. Her misshaps, her failure to find him, or to open the door in time, result from her confinement within the body and her dependence on it and its organs. She advises her lover to leave her for the present and to linger on the hills because she knows that while she is in the body she cannot unite with him, that on the one hand her life in this world is beneficial to her because she acquires in it the intelligibles which qualify her to merge with him

ness of symbolism, which at the same time affords a general view of his theory (f. 128a): "When you consider these three varieties [of interpretation] you will find them parallel to three faculties of the soul. The philosophers call them parts, but we shall not quibble about names when they denote the same idea. The first is the natural whose function is procreation, growth and nourishment. It is common to animals and plants. Procreation is preceded by craving and pleasure accompanies the performance. This corresponds to the first, innate interpretation. The second [faculty] is the vital, common to rational and irrational souls. Its function is the dilation and contraction of the arteries to preserve the natural heat, and it is also the source of the emotions, such as desire, pleasure, joy, anger, fear, kindness, hardness of heart, bashfulness, impudence and the urge to do anything. This corresponds to the second explanation revolving around obedience and disobedience, which are possible only by means of the [common] sense (i. e. the mental registration of the sensations) aided by the stimulating faculty, and submission to, and redemption from the emotions. If we speak of the five well-known senses of the vital faculty it is correct. If it were not for the natural heat of the heart which is their ruler and within which they reside, the brain would not be balanced, because the natural heat rises from it [the heart] to it through the arteries so that it becomes balanced and sound. Its faculties are the nerves which go out from it to enable perception and motion, not to the body. The third is the noetic faculty with which the rational being alone is endowed, out of all existence within the lunar sphere. It is the faculty through which he understands and acquires disciplines, cognition and firm truths. By means of it he discriminates between the beautiful and the ugly. It is the one which is called the rational soul. The stimulative faculty and the imaginative faculty minister to it. This corresponds to the third explanation around which this book revolves."



by the verse *השבעתי אתכם בנות ירושלם*, occurring four times.<sup>101</sup> The procedure of Moses ibn Tibbon and Immanuel of Rome who recognize three stages of the soul in the contents of the book is again an improvement on the method chosen by our author.<sup>102</sup>

However, ibn 'Aḳnīn's work possesses a number of commendable characteristics which compensate for his failure to endow it with continuity and development. His explanations of the text are fuller and more detailed than those of the other philosophic commentators. Adhering to the principle that every word is fraught with meaning and no part of it is included for art's sake, he, unlike the other authors who classify *שה"ש* in the second category of allegories set up by Maimonides,<sup>103</sup> finds a meaning for every individual figure. In each of his three explanations,—literal, Midrashic and philosophic,—he accounts for all the words and phrases and derives pertinent information from them.

What lends this commentary even greater importance is what we may, with no injustice to the author, describe as the

<sup>101</sup> *L. c.*, 2a: החלק הראשון הוא בהיות הגוף בימי היופי והנעימים הם מתחלת החנוך ועד עשרים שנה. החלק השני הוא בהיותו מן הכח והנבירה והחפץ והם עד ארבעים שנה. החלק השלישי הוא בהיותו בימי החכמה והתבונה והדעת והם עד ששים שנה. החלק הרביעי הוא בהיות ימי הזקנה והשיבה ימים אשר אין בהם חפץ והם עד פ' שנה. הנה תמצא בסוף הפרק הראשון והשני שאמר השבעתי אתכם . . . אם תעירו ואם תעוררו . . . ובסוף החלק השלישי תמצא מתחלת מן השבעתי אתכם . . . אם תמצאו את דודי מה תנידו לו . . . ובסוף החלק הרביעי נ"כ מתחלת השבעתי אתכם . . . מה תעירו . . . ואיש על מקומו אפרשנו בעזרת הבורא. The verses following the last adjuration (8.5-14) are a peroration by the soul admonishing the body to realize the former's superiority.

<sup>102</sup> According to ibn Tibbon, whom Immanuel quotes and even copies at length, the first stage is before the soul encounters tests, when man acquires his learning by tradition and not by reasoning; the second stage is when man's perfection is actual, and he achieves immortality with the aid of "the wife", i. e., the three stages of learning; the third is when man's learning besets him with difficulties and the union does not lead to unqualified happiness. Cf. ibn Tibbon, *l. c.*, 23b-24b, and Immanuel, *l. c.*, 2-5.

<sup>103</sup> Cf. ibn Tibbon, *l. c.*, 8 (of Introd.); ibn Kaspi, *l. c.*, 1b (see note 45 above); Immanuel, *l. c.*, 5. Levi ben Gerson grants only for some of the contents that it is *לפי המשל* *לבר*; the rest either possesses implicit significance in addition to the exoteric, or has only an inner meaning since literally it is altogether unsuitable, *l. c.*, 4c-d.



irrelevant material in it. Following the rambling style of Arabic writers, and conserving neither space nor energy, he talks at length about everything which appears interesting to him and has some justification for its inclusion. Twice he argues that *שושנה* must mean rose and not lily. It is roses which grow among thorns and not lilies, and the maiden could not possibly liken her lover's lips to *שושנים* if they were lilies.<sup>104</sup> Explaining that Tīrṣāh was given this name because whoever saw her was pleased by her appearance, he informs us that in the Orient there is a city called *Surra-man-ra'a* (happy is he who sees-Samarra).<sup>105</sup> In connection with the mention of myrrh in 5.1, which he renders musk,<sup>106</sup> he justifies the use of the verb *אריתי* by relating how musk is obtained in Tibet and China.<sup>107</sup> He is exceedingly generous with grammatical elucidations.<sup>108</sup> In every verse the words, whether nouns or verbs, are analyzed into their component parts, the root is classified, and the construction is described. When a construction is unusual or difficult, he resorts to various expedients to resolve or explain it, and adduces parallels from the Bible to support his solution. The *Yod* in *לסוסתי* (1.9) is superfluous, the word being in the construct state.<sup>109</sup> In 3.6. *אחוזי הרב* is like *אחוזי הרב*, just as *עשוק* (Jer. 22.3) is *עושק* and *השכוני* (Jud. 8.11) is *השוכני*. "The form was chosen because afterwards *מלומדי* is written, and they wished to balance, liken and couple the words. The same thing is done in *ואת מוצאך ואת מובאך*

<sup>104</sup> F. 15a and 76a.

<sup>105</sup> F. 81b.

<sup>106</sup> For the divergences of opinion on the meaning of *מר* cf. Markon's article in *Saadya Studies*, Manchester, 97-103, and Salfeld, *l. c.*, 148-149. See also *אשכול הכפר*, Alphabet 45, (25a).

<sup>107</sup> F. 63a-b. His description is an almost verbatim extract from Mas'ūdi, *Murūj al-Dhahab* ed. Barbier de Maynard, I, 354-356; ed. Mişr, I, 98. An English translation is available in Sprenger, *El-Mas'ūdi's Historical Encyclopedia*, I, 365-366. Our author served as source to Saadia ibn Danan (Neubauer, *Journal asiatique*, 1862, 214-217, who feels that the rather polemical tone of ibn 'Aḳnīn's argument sounded like a refutation of contrary views (כאנה ירד עלי אבן אלוליד ועלי ר' אברהם בן עזרא ז"ל).

<sup>108</sup> His source for them, as a rule is ibn Janāḥ, altho in his Introduction he recognizes his indebtedness to a number of grammarians from Saadia to Moses Chiquitilla.

<sup>109</sup> F. 12b. This is the usual treatment. See, e. g., ibn Ezra ad loc.

II Sam. 3.25), or מוצאיו ואת מוצאיו (Ezek. 43.11), or הרו והנו (Is. 59.13), treating הנו which is the infinitive of a Kal verb with a weak final letter, coming as it does from פעלך (Ps. 77.13), like הרו which is the infinitive of a Hif'il verb with weak first and last letters, since it is like בני ישראל (Lev. 10.11)."<sup>110</sup> He regards the form לבכחתי (4.9) as a denominative verb from לב with the meaning "you struck with the arrows of your eyes",<sup>111</sup> and adds that although Arabic also builds verbs from nouns, it does not do it in this case.<sup>112</sup> For אם (3.5) he prefers the rendering *that*, citing parallels from the Torah.<sup>113</sup> His comment on the word אהו (2.15) is curious. Forgetting that he is dealing with the Hebrew root and not with its Arabic cognate, he takes pains to explain that the first letter in the word is the *prosthetic alif* which is added to imperatives, and that the radical has been dropped as in other *primae alif* verbs.<sup>114</sup> An equally surprising performance is found in his discussion of 4.5. For whereas in the verse he writes correctly הרעים, the comment undertakes to explain what the text means by using הרועה where הרעים is required.<sup>115</sup>

<sup>110</sup> F. 36b–37a [38b–39a]: ואנא פעל דלך למא קאל בעדה מלומדי פאראדוא: העדיל אללפט ותסויה ותוויה כמא פעלוא את מוצאך ואת מוצאיו ואת מוצאיו פחמלוא אלמעתהל [קרי: אלמעתהל] אל פא מהל אלמעתהל (מערתהל) אלעין ואצל מובא אן יכון מבוא לאן אצלה בא מבוא וכקולהם איצא הורו והונו פחמלוא הונו והוא מצדר פעל כפף (מחמל) אלמעתהל (מערתהל) אללאם אד והו מן והניתי בכל פעלך מחמל הורו אלדי הו מצדר פעל תקיל מעהל אללאם אד והו מהל ולהורות את בני ישראל. The passage is taken verbatim from ibn Janāh's *Luma'*, 12 l. 20 ff.

<sup>111</sup> F. 49b [51b]: אכזה קלבי בסהם עיניך. Probably אכזה is either a substitution or an error for אצבה in the same phrase in ibn Janāh's *Kitāb al-Uṣūl*, s. v. לב. That our author found his explanation there is evident from his comment on עורות לבובין (ורה, עבודה זרה, 32a) which is ibn Janāh's. Cf. also R. Asher and R. Nissim ad לבובין, T. Nedarim, 13b, and Gavison, עומר, השכחה, 24d.

<sup>112</sup> This remark is surprising in the face of ibn Janāh's rendering קלכחתי, and the meaning of striking the heart which is given in the dictionaries under קלב (but see David al-Fasi, ed. Skoss, II, 146). He goes on to say that "language is learned and not derived by analogy" (מסמועה לא מסיסה), ib. and 86b).

<sup>113</sup> F. 720: ואחסן מן הדא מא אקול אן אם הנא חחקיק ותחבית ומתלה ואם יהיה היובל. ואחסן מובא אבנים. Cf. ibn Janāh, *l. c.*, s. v. אם and *Mekhilto*, 11.4 (ed. Ish-Shalom 73b).

<sup>114</sup> F. 25b.

<sup>115</sup> F. 45a [47a].

He is fond of numbers and calculations. The reference to the "sixty heroes" (3.7) leads him into an examination of the number.<sup>116</sup> Being the product of the perfect six by the imperfect ten it stands for the union of the soul and the body. But the number may also symbolize sixty organs and parts of the body which are all servants of the rational soul. In his discussion of 6.8, he enumerates, on the authority of the Rabbis the sixty kings and the eighty concubines.<sup>117</sup> In the same passage he also undertakes to reconcile the apparent contradiction between the Babylonian and the Palestinian decisions regarding the difference in the law of marriage between *אשה*, *פלגש*, and *יפת תאר*.<sup>118</sup>

If, as has been pointed out, he defends his utilization of Arabic lore, he has good reason to do so. His book is rich in extraneous material. He quotes al-Fārābī, his favorite philosopher, Avicenna, and Muslim and Jewish poets and writers.<sup>119</sup> He decides in favor of Aristotle, whom Galen contradicts, that the heart is the chief organ and the brain is subsidiary to it.<sup>120</sup> In his exposition of 4.3 he calls attention to the fact that sometimes a person's appearance may be lovely and his speech ugly. In support of this he quotes a verse from an Arab poet: When she smiles she reveals pearls, and when she speaks she drops them.<sup>121</sup> Then he proceeds to relate the following anecdote: "Our wise and glorious poet Rabbi Judah ha-Levi is credited with a wonderful witticism on this subject which we have decided to include here because it is appropriate to our discussion. I was told by one

<sup>116</sup> F. 36a-b [38a-b]. Six is a perfect number because the quotients of its division total six (3,2,1), but ten is deficient because the quotients (5,2,1) equal eight. He follows a similar procedure in 6.8.

<sup>117</sup> F. 86a-b. See Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, v, 195 (note 72); Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine*, 15 n. 3. The list is given in detail *Midrash ha-Gadol* (ed. Margolioth), 192-193. [Comp. also *REJ* 54, 1907, p. 54 ff. S. L.]

<sup>118</sup> F. 86b-88b.

<sup>119</sup> Among them Abu Nuwās, Mutanabbi, ibn Gabirol, Mas'ūdi.

<sup>120</sup> F. 9a and 62a (ומדהב ארסנו הו אלהק). So also in his comment on 2.6 (f. 18b) and in his introd. to *טב אלנפוס* (f. 80). He is doubly convinced of this because it agrees with the Bible's stress on the heart as the seat of knowledge and understanding. Cf. Kaufmann, *Die Sinne*, 62-66.

<sup>121</sup> F. 43a [45a]. פמן לולו תלזה ענד אבתסאמאה ומן לולו ענד אל חדיה תסאקסה. Kaufmann's rendering (see next note) although more literal seems to miss the sense.



of the elders of Granada, who was present at a social gathering in one of its finest mansions, which was attended by a number of leading men, including Rabbi Judah ha-Levi, engaged in an earnest inquiry that as they were extolling the wisdom of the Creator in His creation, a beautiful and well-dressed woman walked by them. They were amazed and praised God for the perfection of His creatures. While they were admiring her beautiful face and her lovely form, she began to speak to someone who walked with her, and they heard an ugly voice and vile speech. Thereupon Rabbi Judah ha-Levi said: "The mouth which bound is the mouth which set free." And all who heard it enjoyed his application of a Rabbinic saying in this poetic sense."<sup>122</sup>

The rather strange simile "Thy teeth are like a flock of ewes" (6.6) provokes our author to remark that inasmuch as שה"ש is intended for the masses as well as for the learned, the comparison with ewes is more practical than with pearls because the ordinary person is much more familiar with the qualities and the benefits of ewes.<sup>123</sup> Then he implores God's pardon to ibn Gabirol who, failing to perceive the wisdom of the simile, criticized Solomon severely for it.<sup>124</sup>

ולשעארנא אלחכם אל אול ר' יהודה הלוי ז"ל פי הוא אלמעני נאדר טריף ראינא: Ib. <sup>122</sup> אהבאחה הגא לכוונה לאיקא באלמעני למא נחן בסבילה אכברנא בעץ אלמשאיך מן אהל אנראטה נ"ע אנהם חצרוא פי נוהל ומולס אנה אנהמע פיה נמלה מן אלאנלא ואלאטיאן ומנהם ר' יהודה הלוי נ"ע פי קצבה מן קצבהא משרפה על[י] פחצרה אלנמיל פבינמא הם (פבימנהם) מחענבון מן חכמא אלבארי פי כלה פאדא באמראה חסנה אלונה ואל מלבס פחענבוא מן נמלאהא ושכרוא אללה חע' עלי אחקאן מצנועאחה פבינמא הם מחענבון[א] (א) מן חסן צנועאחה ואעחראל כלקחא פאדא בהא תחדת מן תמאשי [מערוא?] (אנהא) פסטעוא לה[א] צות קביח ומנטק סמנ פקאל ענד סמאעה דלך אל צות הפה שאסר הוא הפה שהחיר פטרב אלסאמעון The passage was edited and translated into German by Kaufmann (*MGWJ*, 36 [1887], 89–91), and into Hebrew by Schirmann (*Tarbiz*, 9, 45).

וקד ישכך פי הוא אל קול פנקול (קרי: פיקאל) למ שבה נטאם אל אסנאן: F. 83b: בקטע אלנגס ולא שבה[ה] באלדר אלמנטום... פאקול פי חל הוא אלשך אן אלדי קצד אליה אלחאכס (קרי: אלחכם) עאס הו אלצואב ודלך אנה קצד אלחשביה באלאשהר ללכיל מנהא שהורהא ונקאיהם ואנטמאם בעצאה אלי בעץ פי ראס אלנבאל ופי אלמנפעה...

ולמא למ יפהם הוא אלמעני מר' שלמה נ' נבירול נ"ע תעטיי (קרי: תעאטי) למא: Ib. <sup>124</sup> תעאטי מן אלדר עלי אלחכים עאס

והמה כחרויו דר ברורים  
בחקמתו פנינים לעדרים  
ועזב את לבבו לבקרים

ושני הצבי חיים וקרים  
ואחמה משלמה המדמה  
כאלו אבדה בהם עצמו

Since his favorite pursuit is the philosophic interpretation of Biblical passages, his digressions in this field are the most numerous. On page 2 of his introduction he gives a philosophic rendering of Exodus 23.21, 22.<sup>124a</sup> In this connection he also expounds Psalms 18.19, and Proverbs 20.27 along the same line. In the course of his explanation of why left precedes right in 2.6, he digresses to account for the more natural order in Proverbs 3.16.<sup>125</sup> Verse 3.5 leads him to explain that "by the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread" (Gen. 3.19) means that learning can be acquired only through toil.<sup>126</sup> But his longest excursus, occasioned by the phrase אַבְקַת רוּכַל (3.6) is his rationalization of Jacob's encounter with the angel (Gen. 32.25–33), in which ibn 'Aḳnīn, true to his method, converts the episode, including proper names and the injunction against eating the sinew of the thigh-vein into the story of an attempt by Jacob to achieve union between his soul and the Active Intellect while the former is still within the body.<sup>127</sup> His explanation attracted attention, owing probably to the difficulty involved in the acceptance of of the literal meaning of the incident. It is repeated, in abridged form, in the eclectic Pentateuch-commentary of the thirteenth-century Baḥya ben Asher, who credits it to "a philosopher of our faith, of Seville,"<sup>128</sup> in his commentary on the Song of Songs.

שירי שלמה בן יהודה אבן גבירול, ביאליק ורבינצקי. Cf. עפא אללה ענא וענה ונפר לנא ולה, I, 165 and II, 128. Moses ibn Ezra criticizes these verses for stylistic reasons (שירת ישראל, קנ"ד), Parḥon, מחברת הערוך, s. v. פנן points out that Gabirol mistakenly believed פנינים to be white. Tanḥūm Yerushalmi also cites the verses (Berliner's *Magazin*, 1888, 6).

<sup>124a</sup> This discussion is reproduced in ס' המוסר, 102–3, with reference to our work and to *Tibb al-Nufūs*.

<sup>125</sup> F. 18a.

<sup>126</sup> F. 31b: ועלי מא פסרנא נחן פי אחד תפ[א]סירנא בזעת אפך האכל לחם פעבר ען: אלהכמה בלהם כמא קיל לכו לחמו בלהמי פאעלם אנה לא תנאל אלתורה אלא בכד וכמא קיל איצא פי מחכם תנוילה זאת התורה אדם כי ימות באהל.

<sup>127</sup> Ff. 32b–36a (see note 52). It is his philosophic treatment of the injunction which provoked his attempt to reconcile his view with Maimonides' ruling above p. 399.

<sup>128</sup> So ed. Geiger reads משיבטה instead of משוביליה (apud Steinschneider, *l. c.*, 86; the latter, however, cites a reading ומשכיליה ומשכיליה). Perhaps the reading is correct, and indicates either his city of birth or of sojourn,





the author of *Tibb al-Nufūs* in השכחה<sup>135</sup> there is good reason to believe that our commentary was known to the Gavison family.<sup>136</sup> Isaac Abravanel refers to it as a work על דרך הפשט<sup>137</sup> but it cannot be asserted with certainty that he had read the book. The same doubts may be raised regarding bibliographic notices in several works.<sup>138</sup> Joseph ben Ḥayyūn makes mention of it in his own commentary on the Song,<sup>139</sup> and Immanuel Aboab, evidently not from personal knowledge, appraises it in his *Nomologia* as a composition "Which is said to be wonderful" (que se tiene por admirable).<sup>140</sup> The possibility, how-

מהם מ שפירש אותו על דרך עיון הפילוסופים ומכללם החכם הידוע מר ורב יוסף נ' עקנין וצ"ל. See Steinschneider, *l. c.*, 69–70 and Salfeld, *l. c.*, 107.

<sup>135</sup> F. 31d: בעצמו מצאחי בס' רפואו' הנפש של ר' יוסף בן עקנין ז"ל שכתב בשם: ה"ר יהודה הלוי ז"ל.

<sup>136</sup> In the course of his explanation of מין (1.4), our author writes (f. 8a; I render the passage in Hebrew so that the comparison will be clearer): ... ובזכרו היין הזה הוסיף על דבריו בפסוק הראשון כי טובים דודיך מין שאותו: היין הקודם לא התענן אלא בשתייתו ואלו זה התענן בזכרו. וכן דברו משוררי ערב בענין הזה בשבח הנאתו. אמר אלחנן בן האני [אבו נואס]: יא פאסקני כמרא וקאל לה אלכמר [הנכון: אלכמר] פאסקני כמרא וקל לי הי כמר, עיין דיואן, הוצ' טצר, 273] (היו השקני יין ואמר לי יין הוא). והלך בעקבותיו משוררנו מר שלמה בן נבירול נ"ע ואמר נמס לבב היושבים עד קפאה כי חבקה החשקים ארבעה עין הציצה וכוס התפש ויד האחוה ולבב בהדרה תעה (עיין כל שירי רשב"ג, ו' שיר י'). מנה ארבעה חושים המתעננים בו, הראשון חוש הראות והוא אמרו עין תציצה, אח"כ אמר וכוס התפש הנאתו בעת יניש לו המשקה את הכוס, שיוכר את שמו ויתענן בזכרו, וחוש זה הוא חוש השמע, והשלישי חוש המשוש והוא אמרו ויד האחוה והרביעי חוש הטעם והוא אמרו ולבב בהדרה תעה ירצה שמחת הנפש בה. ואנו נאמר לו המשיך ואמר שהחמשה יתעננו Compare this with the statement in השכחה עומר, 18c–d, ad Prov. 7:18: גם ראיתי שיר לחכם ישמעאלי: משביח בשבח היין ועל כל בית ובית אומר אסקני אלכמר וקל לי ואנא כמר (עיין לעיל) ר"ל השקני היין ואחר כל כוס אמור לי זה ששתית יין הוא והכוונ' להשלים הה' חושים כי חוש הטעם הנו מצוי וחוש הראות נ"כ הנה הוא מסתכל בו וחוש הריח הרי הוא מריחו וחוש המשוש הוא ממששו נעדר חוש השמע צהו להטיב ולהמתיק חוש השמע לאמר זה יין הוא זה יין הוא The similarity is striking particularly since there is little in the line and less in the poem to suggest the exegesis given it by the two authors.

<sup>137</sup> Introduction to commentary on מורה (ed. Wilno p. 3a).

<sup>138</sup> Steinschneider, *l. c.*, 70 note 91. The passage in Zacuto's ספר היוחסין (ed. Filipowski, 219) is interesting: וזה הספר ר"ל המורה עשאו להלמידו הפילוסוף: ושעשה פירוש לשיר השירים פ' ארוך ונחמד בענינו מכל הלמידיו ר' יוסף בן שמעון בן עקנין. אבל בתחלת המורה אומר להלמידו יוסף בן יהודה

ובעל הפירוש הוא החכם ר' יוסף עקנין ז"ל שהיה תלמיד: It seems unlikely that he knew this commentary directly.

<sup>140</sup> Ed. 1727, p. 301. He calls him Rabi Joseph ha-Cohen. Cf. Munk, *l. c.*, 9 note 3, and Steinschneider, *l. c.*, notes 3 and 63.

ever, should not be lost sight of that the philosophic interpreters of ש"ש may have known his work and even been influenced by it.<sup>141</sup>

Ibn 'Aḡnīn felt very proud of his accomplishment, confident as he was that he uncovered the hidden sense of this superficially erotic drama. "The inclusion of rich meanings in brief words, he says, is what no man can perform, save in this noble book pronounced by the Divine Spirit, which, if all are Sacred Scriptures, is the Holiest of Holy. So we thank God our Lord Who helped us to understand it and to elicit its meanings which are concealed in these words.<sup>142</sup> If we cannot quite share his enthusiasm, we recognize his merit as a man of his age who was the first to adapt the eternal song of love to the mood and standard of his day.

#### APPENDIX

The following extract is offered as a concrete illustration of our author's exegesis. The Arabic original is not given, unless a particular reason requires it. The rendering is in Hebrew because it forms part of a forthcoming edition and translation of the commentary.

<sup>141</sup> Thus, for example, it is a likely supposition that Tanhūm Yerushalmi's application of יונה to the rational soul is borrowed from our author. Cf. 25a: חם שבה אלנאטקה באלחמאמה לאנסהא פכמא אן אלחמאם יאלף אל אנסאן פכדלך אלפחני with Tanhūm's parallels (commentary on Jonah, ed. Kokowzoff, 117), and see his commentary on לבבחיני (4.9, Eppenstein in Berliner's Magazin, vol. 15, 1888, 14) with our author's remark f. 52a.

<sup>142</sup> F. 57a: וסיקאן מעאני כחירה פי (אל)אלפאט וניזה מא ליס ימכן לאנסאן סיאקה: אלא פי הדא אלכחאב אלעטים אלנפר אלמקול ברוח הקדש אלדי ואן כאנת כלהא כתבי הקדש פהו קדש קדשים פשכרנא אללה רבנא מעינא עלי פהמה ואכראא מעאניה אלתי סרהא פי אלפאטה הדא. He is even more explicit in another connection, after expounding 8.4 (110a): נחמד אללה תעלי [עלי] מא אלהמנא אליה מן אל חכם ואשלענא עליה מן אל: אסראר מא לם יתבה לה גירנא מן קבל ואקול אנה לו בלג אל חכים עאס שרחנוא הדא ועלם פרמנא כלאמה מן ארמו ואכראנא לה מן קשור אלפאטה לבהא לחמדנא עלי דלך ואסתרענא ללחעלים מנה חכמתה וראי אן נחן אולא בהא מן גירנא ואחק בהא ממן סואנא. (We praise God for the wisdom which He revealed to us and the secrets which He divulged to us to a degree of which no predecessor of ours was aware. I declare: if this commentary of ours reached the Sage [Solomon] and he knew that we understood the symbols of his discourse, and extracted the kernel from the husk of its words, he would praise us for it, and would select us to teach us his wisdom, realizing that we were more deserving of it than any other and more worthy than anyone else).

מים רבים לא יוכלו לכבות את האהבה ונהרות לא ישטפוה אם יתן איש את כל הון ביתו באהבה בוז יבוזו לו. ספרה כי האש שנצתה בלבה בגללו לא יוכלו המים הרבים לכבותה מלבו, ואף הנהרות לוא זרמו כלם אליה לא עקרו אותה מלבה, כי חדרה לתוכו ונאחזה בו. אחר כן אמרה: אם כי חשק אהובי בוער בקרבי והלהבות התלקחו בלבי ובכבדי בעבורו, בכל זאת לוא נתן לי איש חשוב והציע לי בה את כל הון ביתו שאבטל אהבתו מלבי כי עתה לענו לו ההמונים. ואמנם כן, ואיך ילקח הכסף תחת הנפש? ואם תכאב נפשי בי מה אעשה באותו כסף, ומי ישמח בו והנפש עצובה? ופרשנו איש חשוב מלשון דבר האיש אדני הארץ. ויתכן שרצתה לפאר מדרגת האהבה העזה הזאת שהגיעה אליה ואמרה: לוא רצה גדול מן הגדולים להשיגה ולתת כספו לא יכל לעשות כן ונלאה בו, מפני שאין בינו ובינה מה שביני ובינה כי טבעית היא לי ונבראתי עמה, ולמתאמרים בה היא מקרה מהיר לעוף. וכן אמר ארסטו וזה לשונו: ההבדל שבין ההתקשטות לטבוע כהבדל שבין האמת לשקר. וכן שר אלמנתי בשירו:<sup>143</sup> כי אורך אפך לא אורך עדיתו; לא ככחל ההתכחלות בעינים.

ולפי מה שנטו אליו רבותינו ז"ל הוא דבר האומה ההוגה באהבת בוראה ועבודתו וכל אומה הרוצה לבטלה מאהבת בוראה ולעכבה מעסק בעבודתו מאיימת עליה בכל מיני יסורים כגון בשרפה באש, כאשר עשה נבוכדנצר לחנניה מישאל ועזריה, ולכך רמזה ברשפיה רשפי אש שלהבתיה, אך לא תחת מפניה כדוגמת חנניה מישאל ועזריה, ותאמין שאותה אש היא משום אהבת רבה אשר בחר בה. ופרוש זה שונה מן הקודם.<sup>144</sup> ורצתה בפסוק הראשון יסורי האש, וכאן הזכירה שאם תטבע במים לא תחדל מעבוד אותו ולא תמחה אהבתו מלבה. אחר כן אמרה אם יתן איש את כל הון ביתו באהבה, ר"ל שכאשר הציעה לה אחת מן האומות הגדולות שתעזב עבודת בוראה ותתן לה כבוד ועושר בזה לה ואמרה לה: איך אקנה את השפל בנכבד ואת האושר המדומה המהיר לעוף באושר האמתי המתמיד? מעשה כסילות הוא לעושהו ומן הדין שימאס בו. ויתכן שכונתה במאמר הזה שלוא רצתה אומה מן האומות הגדולות שיפל בחלקה מה שנפל בחלק ישראל לא יכלה לעשות כן ובזו לה ואמרו לה: עברת חק, והתאווית כשוטה מה שאין לאל ידך להשיגו. ואמרה לה כנסת ישראל כאשר אמר המשורר:<sup>145</sup> וחפץ לעלות אל מעלתי כחפץ לעלות שחק בסלם. ולפי פרוש הסוד שנטנו אליו דברה הנפש השכלית בלשון מים רבים

<sup>143</sup> *Mutanabbi Carmina*, ed. Dietrich, 494 line 44. The original is: (MS.: לא) לאן חלמך חלם לא תכלפה ליס אלתכחל פי אלעיין כאלכחל in honor of Saif al-Dawla. Cf. Nicholson, *Literary History of the Arabs*<sup>2</sup>, 303–313.

<sup>144</sup> In his comment on the verse ad loc. (f. 113a) he has Israel say, with reference to יי, that the grievous sufferings were punishment inflicted by God for its disobedience.

<sup>145</sup> Ibn Gabirol, *שירי רשב"י*, I, 184 line 25. The first word should be והחפץ.



על שתאוות הגוף ונבחות ההיולי לא השיאוה מאהבת השכל הפועל ולא עכבוה מללכת אחריו. ודברה בלשון מים על התאוות כמה שאמר במקום אחר מים קרים על נפש עיפה. והקרימה את המים למאכל מפני שאם יחסרו הם והמוזן זמן רב ואחר יבואו שניהם ליד החסר אותם יודרו לשתות את המים ראשונה כדי לכבות את הדלקת אשר במעייו ולאחר שעה ארוכה יקח את המאכל. אח"כ הוסיפה ואמרה ונדרות לא ישטפוהו ר"ל ההנאה שתינה מן המזון לאחר שנתעכל באצטומכא<sup>146</sup> ואז יהפך לחלוחית וישאב הכבד את הלחלוחית בנידים הדקים הקרויים אלמאסרי"קה, ויבשלהו הכבד עד שישנהו לדם וישגהו לקצוות בכל הגויה וישתנה הדם הזה לבשר בבשר ולחלב בחלב ולעצם בעצם פרט למה שיתמסמס בחמימות מבית ומחוץ, ודברה על הורידים בלשון נהרות ואמרה: הנאות המאכלים לא ישיאוני מהתעסק באהבתו כי לא אקח מהם אלא כשעור המספיק. ואם כי הנאתם מרובה הרי גדול העיסוק באהבתו מהעיסוק בהם למען אשיג את האושר בלכתי אחריו...<sup>147</sup> אלו ומהירות בטולם. ובאמרה אם יתן איש דברה השכלית על הגוף בלשון איש ועל התענוגות בלשון הון ועל כחותיו בלשון ביתו, ואמרה: לוא נתן לי את כל תענוגותיו וכל אשר לי<sup>148</sup> שאטה מאהבת הפועל, כי עתה בוז לו ואמרו לו לא נכון לשמוע בקולך זה. ואיך תעזב את האור ותלך אחרי החשך? והרי יש קרבה בין תבנית השכלית ובין הפועל, ולפיכך היא מקבלת את האור ממנו ומברירה את הספקות השטונים בחובה ולובשת הצורה להדר לה.<sup>149</sup> ואתה אין קרבה בינך ובינה אלא כרחוק מזרח ממערב, אתה במים והיא בשמים, כי את רגלים רצתה וילאוך ואיך תתחרה את הסוסים ובארץ שלום אתה בוטח — רצה מעבר הגוף בעולם הזה בתלאות מסבות הזמן עליו בתמורותיו — ומה יהיה מצבו בעולם הבא המשול בגאון הירדן? הרי יטבע בקרקעיתו וישברוהו גליו.

ויתכן שרצתה השכל הפועל באיש, והיא כמוכיחה אותו ואומרת: לו נתת לי את כל הדעות אשר לך כי עתה היו קלות בעיני מאהבתי לך וששוני כך וזאת ראיה ליקר ערכי וחובה עליך שתעוררני יותר.

ויתכן<sup>150</sup> שרצה במים רבים לא יוכלו את המכשולים העצומים בעמים של

<sup>146</sup> For the physiology cf. the author's *מסד*, 43 ff.

<sup>147</sup> It is quite evident that words are missing as indicated, perhaps a phrase like . . . ולא אשינוהו בהנאות המאכלים עם שלוח . . .

<sup>148</sup> The rendering is doubtful. The Arabic is כלהא ונסבה (א) כלהא ונסבה (א) and כלהא ונסבה. Unless some words have dropped between כלהא ונסבה and כלהא ונסבה little can be done with it. If כלהא ונסבה is a form of כלהא with the forced meaning of *disdain*, the syntax is bad.

<sup>149</sup> Here again the original is not clear. The phrase is וילדלך קבלת אל נור מנה ותדרת לכואיפהא מן אלשכך ואכתסהא אלצורה רונקא.

<sup>150</sup> This passage deals with a subject very prominent in medieval philosophy, and al-Farābī's influence on Jewish authors who deal with it is significant. Cf., e. g., Maimonides, *Iggeret Teman*, [ed. Basel], 97a.







THE *EDITIO PRINCEPS* OF PSEUDO-PHILO'S  
*LIBER ANTIQUITATUM BIBLICARUM*

By GUIDO KISCH

I\*

The period of German Humanism with its awakening interest in ancient literature and old manuscripts produced the first, and until now the only, edition from manuscripts of the preserved Latin text of Pseudo-Philo's *Antiquitatum Biblicarum Liber*. It was Johannes Sichardus (1499-1552) — the learned philologist of the University of Basle and later Professor Ordinarius of Roman law in the University of Tübingen, a friend of Erasmus, Ulrichus Zasius, Bonifatius Amerbach, and Henricus Glareanus — who rendered this invaluable scholarly service.<sup>1</sup> His *editio princeps* was printed in Basle, Switzerland, by Adamus Petrus, in August 1527. Reprints of Sichardus' edition appeared in 1538,

\* My studies on Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* have been carried out under the auspices of the University of Notre Dame which will publish the critical edition of the Latin text that I have been preparing for several years. My thanks are due to Rev. Professor Philip S. Moore, C. S. C., Dean of the Graduate Faculty and Editor of *Publications in Mediaeval Studies*, for his permission to publish the present essay separately. I also wish to express my gratitude to Mr. Howard L. Goodhart of New York City who placed photostats of the Admont and Melk manuscripts, the *editio princeps* and other printed material from his library at my disposal.

<sup>1</sup> The complete title of the *Antiquitates* edition is reprinted in the Appendix *infra*, p. 442. Paul Lehmann, *Johannes Sichardus und die von ihm benutzten Bibliotheken und Handschriften*, "Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters," Band IV, Heft 1 (Munich, 1912), pp. 51-52, 76-84, 118-120, 154-155; Montague R. James, *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo, Now First Translated from the Old Latin Version* (London, 1917), pp. 12-16, 21. — On Sichardus, cf. also Roderich Stintzing, *Geschichte der deutschen Rechtswissenschaft*, I (Munich and Leipzig, 1880), pp. 212-219.

1550, 1552, and 1599.<sup>2</sup> All editions, and particularly the first one and that of 1538, are now extremely rare. The symbol A, chosen for the 1527 edition by Montague R. James, will be retained in the present discussion.

Like many editors of the Renaissance period, Sichardus tells us little of the manuscripts he used, and of his editorial technique. According to his Preface, which is addressed to the monks of Fulda, he had two manuscripts at his disposal: one from Fulda (*exemplar Fuldense vestrum*), and another, very old one (*per-velustum*), earlier obtained from the monastery of Lorsch (*codex Laurissensis* or *Laureshamensis*). Having learned of the existence of a third manuscript, he expected that all these codices together would provide the materials for a satisfactory, scholarly edition. But his manuscripts proved disappointing. Hence, he had to relinquish the hope of remedying the many corruptions which he found and which were caused by the negligence of the medieval scribes. He had no choice but to reproduce the text as it was. Sichardus was well aware of the resulting inadequacy of his edition, which proved much to his regret to have been undertaken very precipitately. But the evils of delay seemed greater to him than those of haste; all the more so, since he looked forward to putting forth a greatly improved text in the future. Under the circumstances, it was the editor's task merely to follow the available manuscripts closely, and to deviate from them as little as possible. His two manuscripts were as alike as

<sup>2</sup> Joannis Alberti Fabricii *Bibliotheca Graeca sive notitia scriptorum veterum Graecorum editio nova curante* Gottlieb Christophoro Harles, IV (Hamburg, 1795), p. 746: "Philonis — *libri antiquitatum: quaestionum in Genesin, de Essaeis; de nominibus hebraeis*, (interprete Hieronymo), *de mundo*; (interprete Guil. Budaeo), latine. Basil. per Adam Petrum. 1527. fol. et 1538.4. atque in *Micropresbytico*, 1550. fol. — Cum Ioannis Sichardi ad sodales ecclesiae Fuldensis epistola, in qua se exemplaribus Fuldensi et Laurissensi usum scribit; vid. Maittair, A. T. II, pag. 687. et Lambacheri *bibliothecam antiquam Vindobon. civicam*, etc., part. I., Viennae Austriae, 1750. 4. pag. 285. qui in nota observat, primam edit. Paris. 1520. ab altera, quae sequuta est Basileae cum aliis eiusdem auctoris opusculis ann. 1526. opera Ioan. Sichardii hinc inde discrepare, praecipue ad finem. Differtne igitur etiam ab edit. Basil. 1527?" — Cf. Leopoldus Cohn et Paulus Wendland, *Philonis Alexandrini Opera quae supersunt*, I (Berlin, 1896), p. L; Lehmann, *op. cit.*, p. 51; James, *op. cit.*, p. 8. On the several editions, see *infra*, Appendix.

two eggs, so that he was certain that one was a copy of the other, although they were preserved in libraries far apart.<sup>3</sup>

Of these two manuscripts, that of Lorsch still remains undiscovered and is probably lost. The Fulda manuscript, traceable in library catalogues of the late sixteenth century, has been rediscovered and identified, first by Leopold Cohn, and later, independently, by Paul Lehmann, in a manuscript (Theol. 4°, 3) of the eleventh century at Cassel, Germany.<sup>4</sup> The identity of the Cassel codex with that used by Sichardus has been ascertained by more than one indication. It has the old Fulda pressmark, and also retains the old label of the fourteenth century, with the title, *Liber Philonis Antiquitatum*. Its cover bears an inscription by Sichardus stating that he had it rebound in 1527: "Jo. Sichardus in gratiam vetustatis hunc Philonis librum male cohaerentem reconcinandum curavit. An. [MD] XXVII. Mens. Augusto." But, even more, Lehmann discovered that the *editio princeps* was made directly from this manuscript, which still shows corrections and marks at the hands of Sichardus and the *metteur en pages* of the printer. The glosses, summaries, and brief remarks in Sichardus' handwriting found in the margin of

<sup>3</sup> The important passages in Sichardus' Preface read as follows: "Cuiusmodi mihi pleraque sunt visa, quae cum nos diu multumque varie distraxissent, dum videlicet hoc agimus, ut lucem aliquam auctori afferamus, ut sensimus tandem nihil procedere, et exemplaria, quorum duo habuimus, tam constanter, tamque ex composito mendas suas tueri, consilium quod mutandorum quorundam coeperamus plane abieciimus, imitati id quod utrunque exemplar haberet, quae tamen ita erant inter se similia, ut nec ovum diceret ovo magis, ut dubium mihi non esset, quin ex altero esset alterum descriptum, utcunque magno loci intervallo dissita. Quippe attuleramus commodum illud Fuldense vestrum, cum antea ex Laurissensi coenobio impetrassemus pervetustum quidem illud, et quod nobis felicissimae editionis magnam spem fecerat, sed progressos paululum non modo foede destituit, sed et fecit, ut praeproperae nos editionis plurimum poeniteret. Nam eiusmodi rerum difficultas, ubi sedulitati atque vigiliis, quibus sane non pepercimus, nihil relinqueret loci, et in hoc res esset haud obscure iam, ut non solum nostra esset nobis subeunda culpa, sed et scribarum, dedimus operam, ut ab exemplaribus quam minimum discederemus, ut sicubi fortasse extaret aliud exemplar, id quod tum inaudieramus, eius collatione nostra, quae, rudia et inchoata nobis exciderant verius, quam quod sint emissae, absolventur."

<sup>4</sup> Lehmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 78 f.; pp. 118 f.; James, *op. cit.*, p. 13.



the Fulda manuscript are all identical with the *marginalia* of the 1527 edition. Furthermore, Lehmann's collation of the Fulda manuscript with the printed text disclosed to some extent Sichardus' working method.

About one thousand textual deviations from the Fulda version must be ascribed to the editorial technique of the humanist editor. These deviations concern orthography, above all, the spelling of Hebrew and Greek proper names and words in particular.<sup>5</sup> Regarding vowels: ae instead of e is employed very frequently; e instead of i, occasionally (e. g., ed., p. 25, 20 *pennam* for *pinnam*; 41, 40 *trenum* for *trinum*); i instead of ii, not infrequently, and almost exclusively in demonstrative pronouns (e. g., ed., 5, 12, and 6, 18, 21, 33, *hi* for *hii*; ii instead of i, always in composite verbs of *iacere*; i for y, in foreign words (e. g., ed., 16, 48 *Sion*, 22, 19 *Silon*); y instead of i, frequently in foreign words (e. g., ed., 2, 47 *abyssi*; 3, 3 *cataclysmo*; 6, 22 *Babylonis*; 9, 48 *Aegypti*; 17, 17 *synagoga*). — Regarding consonants: the aspirate is eliminated frequently in *eremus* (e. g., ed., 12, 4, 8, and 13, 17, and 16, 4, 23, 37); also ed., 12, 32, in *abominamentum*; 22, 26 and frequently in *Israel* for *Israhel*; 2, 36, *Arcam*; 4, 30, *Phalec*; 12, 22, *coruscantium*. The aspirate is added, frequently to t in foreign words (e. g., ed., 1, 30, 31, *Mathusalam*; 4, 2, *Domereth*; 4, 32, *Phalthia*; 14, 33, *thuribulum*; 44, 30 *thus*); but also in cases of a different kind (e. g., ed., 13, 16, *myrrham*; 14, 34, *hippomidem*; 23, 8, *Hierusalem*; 36, 33, *horae*; 39, 14, *hypocrisi*; 43, 3, *hos*; 49, 2, *exhorruit*; 56, 20, *hymnizare*; 4, 17, *Chanaan*; 8, 9, *Chaldaeorum*; 28, 38, *Achates*; 41, 24, *lachrymis*). — Assimilations of consonants (e. g., ed., 43, 2, *appono*; 43, 37, *supposuit*; 55, 28, *attulerunt*; 2, 34, *immaculatus*). Gemination introduced (e. g., ed., 4, 22, *Cappadoces*; 14, 44, *hyssopum*; 16, 20, *apparuit*; 35, 15, *turificationis*). Gemination eliminated (e. g., ed., 17, 16, *deglutiret*; 17, 19, *glutitus*; always in *pecus* and *oculus*). — Individual consonants: b instead of p (e. g., ed., 13, 20 *hebdomade*; 22, 30, *presbyteri*; 23, 15, *obtulit*); d instead of t (e. g., ed., 22, 27, *Gad*; frequently in *David*); d instead of th, rarely (e. g., ed.,

<sup>5</sup> The tabulation is reproduced from Lehmann, *op. cit.*, p. 79 f. The abbreviation "ed." refers to Sichardus' *editio princeps*. The spelling of Sichardus' edition is given first, that of the manuscript, second.

1, 29, *Elid*); g instead of c, sometimes (e. g., ed., 17, 28, 32, *Amigdalinas*; 28, 28, *smaragdino*; 28, 32, *stigmatus*); ph instead of f or v, very frequently in proper names (e. g., ed., 1, 7, *Phua*; 1, 29, *Pheledi*; 4, 32, *Zaphis*); qu instead of c, at times in *quum* (e. g., ed., 4, 36); c instead of qu or q, at times (e. g., ed., 43, 1, *locutus*; 33, 11, *persecutionem*); t instead of c, before i, so frequently that no examples need be given; v instead of f, rarely (e. g., ed., 16, 8, *vectibus*); x instead of xs, always in *exurgere* and *expectare*; z instead of c, frequently in *zelare* (e. g., ed., 12, 34; 18, 33; 46, 25; in *hymnizare*, e. g., ed., 50, 48).

The emendations resulting from the editorial principles, which are apparent from the above tabulation, comprise only part — although a great part — of Sichardus' corrections. It is a difficult task to account for the other, more important part. As previously mentioned, another manuscript (from Lorsch) was employed for the *editio princeps*, besides that from Fulda. The Lorsch manuscript has not yet been rediscovered and is perhaps permanently lost. In the absence of this main source, Lehmann substituted the Munich manuscripts for a collation. This collation was not confined to the *Antiquities* but also included the genuine Philonian works in Sichardus' edition. Lehmann found corresponding readings for more than four hundred variants of the 1527 edition in the manuscripts. This warrants the conclusion that Sichardus adopted from the Lorsch manuscript numerous readings that are not accounted for in the Fulda codex. However, no corresponding readings could be found in other manuscripts for about another four hundred variants of the 1527 edition. Hence, according to Lehmann, emendations must also be ascribed to Sichardus. Although the humanist scholar did not reproduce the text of his *Vorlagen* with minute accuracy, he followed it closely. True, his corrections and emendations are not ingenious, but neither are they arbitrary or irresponsible. Sichardus proves himself a "vorsichtiger Kritiker."<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Lehmann, *op. cit.*, p. 83: "Für die eigentliche Emendation hat Johannes Sichardus somit in den meisten Fällen nur indirekt etwas geleistet, indem er uns die Lesarten der grösstenteils verlorenen Codices mitgeteilt hat; wo es hiess, zwischen mehreren zu wählen, zeigte er, dass er wohl ein vorsichtiger,

## II

This general characterization of Sichardus' editorial technique, however, does not offer a solution for all the problems of textual criticism that arise with regard to the *Antiquitates*. Conclusions and conjectures concerning the quality of the lost Lorsch version, therefore, must be made with utmost caution.

First, it does not seem probable that the unification of the orthography which was, to some extent, a modernization was based on or modelled after the Lorsch version. If this manuscript were really "*pervetustum*," it certainly would not have had it. There is a much greater probability that the unified orthography resulted solely from Sichardus' endeavor to produce a modern and readable edition from old manuscripts, for the use of scholars. He also applied the same method to other manuscripts.

Second, the fact that in one place the *editio princeps* contains a passage which is missing in the Fulda manuscript and therefore certainly derived from the Lorsch manuscript deserves reconsideration. It is an extensive passage containing the end of the *Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesin* and the beginning of the *De Essaeis*, covering the text of p. 82, l. 40 to p. 84, l. 16 of Sichardus' edition. The fact that the editor derived this lengthy passage from the Lorsch codex, where he also found the separation of the *De Essaeis* from the *Quaestiones*, absent in the Fulda codex, is attested to by a marginal note on page 82 of the *editio princeps*: "Variabant hic exemplaria, secuti tamen sumus Laurissanum ut vetustius." The authenticity of that lengthy passage, borrowed from the Lorsch codex, is verified by Greek fragments of the *De Essaeis* and by an Armenian translation of the *Quaestiones*.<sup>7</sup> Hence, the Lorsch manuscript represented

aber kein genialer Kritiker war. Enger Anschluss an die handschriftlichen Vorlagen ist das Kennzeichen der Sichartschen Textbehandlung, Anschluss, nicht peinlich genaue Wiedergabe des handschriftlichen Wortlautes." Cf. Lehmann, p. 77: "Es ist also zu konstatieren, dass nicht eine mechanische Wiedergabe des handschriftlichen Textes vorliegt, sondern Textkonstitution unter engem Anschluss an die Handschrift, nicht ohne verschiedentliche Änderungen der Schreibweise und einzelne leichte Eingriffe."

<sup>7</sup> Lehmann, *op. cit.*, p. 81.



in fact the unabbreviated version and a better tradition than all the extant Latin manuscripts.

This conclusion is certainly as logical as it is unobjectionable from the point of view of textual criticism. But I wish to emphasize that it must be confined to the manuscript tradition of the *Quaestiones* and the *De Essaeis*.

Two important hypotheses concerning the *Antiquitates* have been based on the aforementioned premise. First, Lehmann correctly argued that the mutilation in the text and the consequent amalgamation of the *Quaestiones* and *De Essaeis* must be older than the Fulda codex, in which no leaves are missing. Moreover, the same peculiarities are also found in other manuscripts which are independent of that of Fulda. Hence, it necessarily follows that the *Fuldensis* and the *Laurissensis* represent two different groups in the manuscript tradition which are independent of one another.<sup>8</sup> Secondly, James carried Lehmann's argumentation further and arrived at the following thesis: "Now, this same gap is found in most, if not in all, of the other manuscripts, and not all of these are copied directly from the Fulda manuscript. We may say, therefore, that all manuscripts showing this gap are independent of the Lorsch manuscript, but not necessarily dependent on the Fulda manuscript."<sup>9</sup> All this is true and reasonable. But it must be restricted to the manuscript tradition of the genuine Philonian works.

Pseudo-Philo's *Antiquitates* call for a separate investigation. It must be as independent of those conclusions as this work is of the Philonian tracts. These are transmitted in some manuscripts without the *Antiquitates* and, vice versa, the *Antiquitates* are found in some manuscripts without the Philonian tracts.

<sup>8</sup> Lehmann, *op. cit.*, p. 81: "Der Laureshamensis repräsentiert also wirklich die ungekürzte Überlieferung. Die Verstümmelung des Anfangs ist in Fulda nicht etwa erst nachträglich durch Blattverlust eingetreten, die Sätze fehlen ohne Angabe einer Lücke mitten auf fol. 86<sup>R</sup> der Handschrift und ausserdem fehlen sie auch noch in einer stattlichen Reihe anderer lateinischer Codices, die keinen sichtbaren Zusammenhang mit Fulda haben. Demnach muss der Textverlust und dadurch die Verschmelzung der beiden Philonischen Schriften früher eingetreten sein: Fuldensis und Laureshamensis gehören verschiedenen Überlieferungsgruppen an."

<sup>9</sup> James, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

There must have been a stage in which for the first time the previously separate chains of manuscript tradition were forged together into one, namely, when the works of the two different authors were combined. Obviously, it will be impossible to determine this stage without the discovery of very old and yet unknown manuscripts. But the almost undeniable fact that two separate chains of manuscript tradition must once have existed for the two different works of the two authors must not be overlooked for their further analysis.

There is a third point, which remained an enigma to the two scholars who successfully devoted so much research to the *editio princeps* of the *Antiquitates* and to the manuscripts that served as its basis.

In his Preface, Johannes Sichardus stated of the Fulda and Lorsch manuscripts: "quae [exemplaria] ita erant inter se similia, ut nec ovum diceris ovo magis, ut dubium mihi non esset, quin ex altero esset alterum descriptum, utcunque magno loci intervallo dissita."

Paul Lehmann who, through his penetrating manuscript studies, was well acquainted with the personality of that outstanding humanist and with his fine scholarly qualities as an editor of ancient writings, sought in vain for a satisfactory explanation of Sichardus' introductory statement. He cast some doubts on the identity of the two manuscripts in question: "If this should actually have been so, then we would have to say that Sichardus allowed himself many more emendations than can be expected according to his Preface. Although the *Laureshamensis* has not yet been rediscovered, it can be easily proved that the alleged conformity (which could have been possible because of the relations between Fulda and Lorsch) is not considerable, and that one cannot easily speak of a dependence of the one manuscript upon the other."<sup>10</sup> To prove this, Lehmann

<sup>10</sup> Lehmann, *op. cit.*, p. 80: "Und wäre dem tatsächlich so gewesen, dann müssten wir sagen, dass Sichart sich sehr viel mehr Eingriffe erlaubt hätte, als man nach der Vorrede erwartet. Trotzdem der *Laureshamensis* noch nicht wieder aufgetaucht ist, erweist sich leicht, dass die behauptete Übereinstimmung — die bei den Beziehungen zwischen Fulda und Lorsch wohl

referred to the large gap in the Fulda manuscript which was not found in the Lorsch codex.

From the same evidence, M. R. James derived the following conclusions: "It is clear from what has been said that Sichardus was wrong in regarding the Fulda manuscript as a copy of that of Lorsch, and that the latter represented an old and valuable tradition; and, further, that he exaggerates greatly when he says that the two manuscripts were as alike as two eggs."<sup>11</sup>

Both attempts to harmonize Sichardus' prefatory statement with the evidence of the manuscripts and his edition are based mainly or exclusively on the extensive gap between the *Quaestiones* and the *De Essaeis*. Lehmann and James made collations of manuscripts with the *editio princeps*, including the *Antiquitates*. In their collations of the latter work they evidently did not find any important passages comparable in extent to the aforementioned large gap, accountable to the lost Lorsch manuscript, with which gaps in the extant manuscripts could be filled. Lehmann and James certainly would not have failed to note such discoveries. This refers particularly to the two large *lacunae* between XXXVII, 1 and 2, and between XXXVII, 5 and XXXVIII, 1, present in all known manuscripts of the *Antiquitates*. My own collations of the Admont and Melk manuscripts with the *editio princeps* and variants from seven additional manuscripts yielded an identical result.<sup>12</sup> According to his

möglich gewesen wäre — nicht weit geht und von einem Abhängigkeitsverhältnis der einen Handschrift von der anderen keineswegs gut die Rede sein kann"; cf. Lehmann, pp. 154 f.

<sup>11</sup> James, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

<sup>12</sup> Guido Kisch, *Tabulated Collation of the Admont Manuscript of Pseudo-Philo's 'Antiquitatum Biblicarum Liber' with Johannes Sichardus' Editio Princeps* (New York, 1940), unpublished manuscript in the library of Mr. Howard L. Goodhart, New York City; G. Kisch, *Tabulated Collation of the Admont and Melk Manuscripts of Pseudo-Philo's 'Antiquitatum Biblicarum Liber' with Johannes Sichardus' Editio Princeps* (New York, 1945), unpublished manuscript in the author's library. — For the passages which are missing in Admont and can be supplemented from the edition of 1527 and vice versa, see the introduction to my forthcoming *Antiquitates* edition; for some insertions of biblical passages by Sichardus in his printed text, see *infra*, p. 437 f.



marginal note on page 38 of his edition, Sichardus noticed a small gap in XXXVI, 4, caused by the omission of two words, and he remarked: "Videtur aliquid deesse." But the two large *lacunae* mentioned above eluded him. Nevertheless, if the Lorsch manuscript had contained the missing text, he doubtless would have inserted it in the proper place in his edition, as he had done in the case of the gap between the *Quaestiones* and the *De Essaeis* in the Fulda manuscript and in several cases of minor *lacunae*. But he did not do this. The only reason for his omission can be found in the fact that the Lorsch manuscript did not contain the two large passages missing in the other manuscripts. The Lorsch manuscript, therefore, must have been as incomplete in this respect as are all extant manuscripts, as far as the *Antiquitates* are concerned. This is also evident from a few passages in the text where Sichardus, rightly or not, suspected a gap because of a missing word and indicated this by an asterisk within a blank space. Hence, the Lorsch version could not represent an independent group to be separated from all existing manuscripts in the classification, as has been assumed until now.

There is the greatest probability — almost certainty — that the Lorsch version of the *Antiquitates* belonged to the same family as do all extant manuscripts, and that it had the same mutilated ancestor from which the other versions were ultimately derived. The number of variants and conjectures noted by Sichardus in the margin of the *Quaestiones* and the *De Essaeis* is disproportionately larger than those given for the *Antiquitates*. It amounts to 122 variants and three emendations on twenty-seven pages, whereas on the sixty pages occupied by the *Antiquitates* only five emendations and one variant reading are listed. This proportion is surprising, indeed. Yet, the texts of Fulda and Lorsch may well have differed in many readings of seemingly minor importance as do almost all medieval manuscripts, even closely related ones. Sichardus may have accepted readings from the Lorsch manuscript which he considered superior to those of the Fulda version. Thus, his statement that his two manuscripts were as alike as two eggs, can be accepted only *cum grano salis*. Most probably they did not derive from one another, although they had a common ancestor.

The fact that the *editio princeps* version of the *Antiquitates* contains quite a few passages missing in the Admont manuscript is also worth noting. This manuscript belongs to the group of three originating in the eleventh century (those of Fulda and Munich-Tegernsee are the others). Admont has one of the finest, if not the best, of the versions among the known and extant manuscripts. It has gaps, but gaps are seldom missing in any product of a medieval scribe. In a number of cases the reason for these *lacunae* is evident: homoioteleuton. The presence of such passages in the 1527 edition, while missing in Admont, proves that they must go back to a still older manuscript. On the other hand, a considerable number of gaps in the *editio princeps* can be filled from Admont, in which important passages have been preserved that are not found in the Basle edition. In other words, manuscript evidence is available for both assertions of Sichardus': that his Lorsch manuscript was *pervetustum*, implying an old and valuable tradition, and that the corruptions were the scribes' fault (*culpa scribarum*).

All told, Sichardus' description of the manuscripts was merely an understandable exaggeration, but was by no means caused by an intention to mislead or by lack of faithfulness. This devoted scholar is in fact beyond such suspicion.<sup>13</sup> He also patently fulfilled his promise to take pains "to depart as little as possible from the manuscripts" ("ut ab exemplaribus quam minimum discederemus").

Finally, a fourth point heretofore unnoticed is deserving of attention. It is the difference in the editorial technique as applied to the *Antiquitates* on the one hand, and to the Philonian works on the other. In the latter texts, the manuscripts must have differed considerably. Much effort was thus devoted by Sichardus to establishing the best possible text. The margin of every page shows variants, among them *pro* instead of *per* (p. 68, l. 14), *Dominus Deus* instead of *Dominus* (p. 69, l. 33), *ergo* instead of *quidem* (p. 70, l. 11), *abundantur* instead of *abundant*

<sup>13</sup> In his Preface he relates incidentally: "Nam eius modi rerum difficultas, ubi sedulitati atque vigiliis, quibus sane non pepercimus, nihil relinqueret loci, . . ." Cf. also the very fair judgment of Lehmann, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

(p. 73, l. 32), *ergo* instead of *enim* (p. 77, l. 39), and *enim* instead of *autem* (p. 82, ll. 7, 20, 31 — three cases on one page). In a few instances, he makes his own conjectures and suggests some emendations. No doubt, this technique was prescribed to the editor by the quality of the manuscripts he had before him.

Sichardus certainly would have adopted the same editorial course for the *Antiquitates* if his manuscripts had warranted such a procedure. In the sixty folio-pages containing the Pseudo-Philonian work, however, only five emendations are suggested: pp. 17, l. 19 (XVI, 7); 33, l. 30 (XXX, 4); 41, l. 21 (XL, 3); 41, l. 46 (XL, 6); 45, l. 37 (XLIV, 10). In all these cases, the Admont and Melk manuscripts have readings identical with those in Sichardus' edition. In one instance, the readings of the Vatican and Viennese manuscripts are also available. Their wording, too, is identical. Thus, in great contrast to the *Quaestiones* and *De Essaeis*, practically no variant readings at all are noted in Sichardus' *marginalia* to the *Antiquitates*. There is only one exception: on p. 33, l. 33 (XXX, 5) a marginal note referring to the name *Debboram* reads "*alias Delboram*," a reading whose authenticity is attested to by the Melk manuscript.

One could almost believe that Sichardus did not collate or use the Lorsch manuscript at all although he had obtained it before that from Fulda, which served as the direct *Vorlage* for the printer. But such an hypothesis must be quickly discarded. For Lehmann, who ascertained the fact that the *editio princeps* was printed directly from the Fulda manuscript, also discovered about four hundred variants in the printed text not accounted for in the Fulda codex or in other manuscripts. He suggested that these be considered as emendations by Sichardus. This is, indeed, one possibility. Another possibility, however, is that these variants of minor importance were taken from the Lorsch manuscript. An author who notes differences such as *Debbora* — *Delbora* and accounts for each of his emendations is not likely to have made hundreds of corrections not based on a manuscript, without accounting for such an incisive editorial practice. Nor would the latter conform with the cautious method which was applied by Sichardus to numerous other manuscripts, as has



been so interestingly revealed by Lehmann. This means, in other words, that the Lorsch version of the *Antiquitates* must, indeed, have been very similar to that of the Fulda codex.

### III

The peculiarity, thus established, of the manuscript *Vorlagen* for the first edition of the *Antiquitates* also explains the difference in the editorial approach of Sichardus. His marginal notes to this work, not burdened with variants or emendations, concentrate on other features. A threefold object can be observed in them.

Most of the marginal notes offer brief summaries of the contents, intended as a quick orientation for the reader, to draw his attention to important sections or paragraphs of the book. To give a few examples: *Jesus filius Nave moritur* (p. 25); *Jahel Sysaram occidit* (p. 34); *Nathaniel angelus praeses ignis* (p. 39); *Elchana* (p. 49).<sup>14</sup> In one place, the invitation to the reader, *Adverte*, is printed conspicuously (p. 37).

In other marginal notes, references to the various books of the Bible are given. These are less frequent than the summaries, but also appear throughout the book.

Finally, in a third group of marginal notes, the results of a collation and critical comparison of the *Antiquitates* with the Bible text are listed. Deviations from the Bible are pointed out. Thus, on the very first page (I, 2) we read: *Et vixit Adam . . . annos DCC*. The pertinent marginal note says: *Historia Geneseos habet DCCC annos, cap. 5*. Similar remarks, for instance, *Non est in Genesi* (p. 6; VI, 3; Gen. 11), or *Judicum liber habet annos VI* (p. 42; XL, 9; Jud. 12, 7), occur from time to time. They are infrequent, but appear occasionally throughout the book bearing witness to the fact that Sichardus compared the *Antiquitates* with the corresponding texts in the Vulgate.

Sichardus may also have derived some of his tacit emendations

<sup>14</sup> These marginal summaries were also useful for the "Memorabilium rerum, quae Philo passim tractat, Index," which precedes the text in the edition. Some of the summaries are repeated there.

from the Bible. Two conspicuous cases may be singled out. In God's speech after the Flood (III, 11), a series of verses from Genesis 9 (8, 9, 11, 3, 4, 6, 1; in this sequence) is either quoted almost literally or rendered freely. In the Admont and Melk manuscripts, verse 11 is immediately followed by verse 4, while verse 3 is omitted. The presence of the latter verse is, however, required for the understanding of verse 4, in which an exception to verse 3 is stated. In fact, we find the first part of verse 3, in the Vulgate version, inserted in Sichardus' edition (p. 3, l. 29): *Et omne quod movetur et vivit, erit vobis in cibum*. In LI, 6, a quotation from Psalm 98, 6 is found which reads thus in the Admont and Melk manuscripts: *Moyses et Aaron in sacerdotibus eius*. The *editio princeps* (p. 51, l. 18) adds the second part of the verse, again in accordance with the Bible text: *et Samuel inter eos*.

These additions could, of course, derive from another manuscript, in which emendations according to the Vulgate may have been incorporated by its scribe. Obviously, such a possibility cannot be entirely ruled out; but it does not seem probable, since the additions are also missing in the Melk manuscript which had a (different) manuscript of the Fulda-Lorsch version among its authorities. Their absence is not due to any obvious reason, for example, to homoioteleuton. A greater probability is that these additions belong to the aforementioned, unaccounted-for emendations which resulted from Sichardus' collation of the *Antiquitates* with the related Bible text. This greater probability becomes almost a certainty when one considers that the interpolated half-verse from Genesis 9, 3 is according to the Vulgate version, whereas the other quotations from Genesis 9 appear to be based on the ancient, pre-Jeromian translation found in the manuscripts. The authority of the Vulgate warranted tacit insertion. Sichardus probably went even further. In several passages borrowed from the Bible, he substituted the Vulgate for the ancient version found in the manuscripts. This method of work can be seen from a few illustrations.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>15</sup> A complete collation of the Pseudo-Philonian Bible quotations with the respective versions of the *Antiqua* and *Vulgata* is a task in itself which goes far beyond the scope of the present investigation. It may lead to interesting

Pseudo-Philo	Bible	Antiqua	Admont and Melk Mss.	Vulgata	A (Ed. Basel, 1527)
III, 1	Gen. 6:1	multi fieri	multi esse	multiplicari	multiplicari
III, 4	Gen. 6:8	[ <i>desideratur</i> ]	Noe autem	Noe vero	Noe vero
III, 9	Gen. 8:22	semen et messis	semen et messis	sementis et messis	sementes et messes
III, 9	Gen. 8:22	die et nocte	die ac nocte	nox et dies	dies ac nox
III, 11	Gen. 9:11	non erit diluvium, ut corrumpat om- nem terram	non adiciam iam cor- rumpere aqua dilu- vii terram	neque erit deinceps diluvium dissipans terram	non adijciam iam cor- rumpere aqua dilu- vij terram
III, 11	Gen. 9:3	Omnia reptilia, quae sunt viva, erunt vobis in escam	[ <i>omiserunt</i> ]	Et omne quod move- tur et vivit, erit vobis in cibum	Et omne quod move- tur et vivit, erit vo- bis in cibum
III, 11	Gen. 9:4	Verum carnem in sanguine animae suae non edetis	Veruntamen carnem in sanguine anime non edetis	Excepto quod carnem cum sanguine non comedetis	Veruntamen carnem in sanguine animae non edetis



Pseudo-Philo	Bible	Antiqua	Admont and Melk Mss.	Vulgata	A (Ed. Basel, 1527)
III, 11	Gen. 9:6	Qui effuderit sanguinem hominis, pro sanguine eius effundetur anima eius: quia ad imaginem Dei feci hominem	Qui enim effundet sanguinem hominis, in manu Dei sanguis eius effundetur, quoniam ad imaginem suam fecit Deus hominem <i>[identical in Vienna and Vatican Mss.]</i>	Quicumque effuderit humanum sanguinem, fundetur sanguis illius: ad imaginem quippe Dei factus est homo	Qui enim effundet sanguinem hominis, sanguis eius effundetur: quoniam ad imaginem dei factus est homo
III, 12	Gen. 9:14	Et erit cum innubilavero nubes super terram, parebit arcus meus in nube	Et erit eum innubilavero nubibus apparebit arcus meus in nube	Cumque obduxero nubibus coelum, apparebit arcus meus in nubibus	Et erit cum innubilavero coelum nubibus, apparebit arcus meus in nube
VII, 5	Gen. 11:9	Propter hoc appellatum est nomen illius Confusio	Et propterea vocatum est nomen loci illius Confusio	Ei idcirco vocatum est nomen eius Babel	Et propterea vocatum est nomen loci illius Confusio [Babel, <i>add. i. m.</i> ]
LI, 6	Ps. 98:6	Moyses et Aaron in sacerdotibus eius: et Samuel inter eos . . .	Moyses et Aaron in sacerdotibus eius.	Moyses et Aaron in sacerdotibus eius: et Samuel inter eos . . .	Moyses et Aaron in sacerdotibus eius, et Samuel inter eos.

In other instances, however, the quotations were preserved as they appear in the *Vorlagen*, as can also be noted from the above tabulation.<sup>16</sup>

These are some details of the editorial approach and technique used by Sichardus in his edition of the *Antiquitates* in 1527. They came to light in my collation of the manuscripts with the *editio princeps*.<sup>17</sup>

and important results but must be left to Bible specialists. Although it is not impossible that Pseudo-Philo used the *Antiqua*, he probably worked independently of it, translating the biblical quotations in the *Antiquitates* from his Greek *Vorlage*. His rendition of Bible passages frequently does not closely follow the wording of the *Antiqua*, although it often resembles it and to some extent even coincides with it. The problem calls for further elucidation.

<sup>16</sup> It is an open question whether a similar "editorial technique" was perhaps applied by scribes earlier than the eleventh century.

<sup>17</sup> Additional observations and their results will be discussed in my forthcoming *Antiquitates* edition, in the chapter on the relationship of the Admont and Melk manuscripts to other manuscripts. Cf. also Cohn, "Prolegomena, I," in Cohn-Wendland, *Philonis Alexandrini Opera quae supersunt*, VI, (Berlin, 1915) p. XIV.

## APPENDIX

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF OLD EDITIONS OF  
PSEUDO-PHILO'S *ANTIQUITATES*

## I

## EDITIO PRINCEPS OF THE LATIN TEXT

- [1] *Philonis Iudaei Alexandrini, Libri Antiquitatum. Quaestionum et Solutionum in Genesin. De Essaeis. De Nominibus Hebraicis. De Mundo.* [Edited by Johannes Sichardus]. [Signet of Adamus Petrus].

Quod Summis uigilijs assequi potuimus, optime lector, id abunde per nos est praestitum, alienam uero culpam nobis, qua es humanitate, non imputabis. Vale, et expecta huius generis a nobis, et maiora, et emendatiora.

Basileae per Adamum Petrum, mense Augusto, Anno M. D. XXVII.

Cum gratia et priuilegio Caesareo.

**Collation:** 2°. 8 unnumbered pages (sign. a2-a3); pp. 1-142; 2 unnumbered pages.

**Contents:** Unnumbered pages: title page, p. 1; Hieronymus in catalogo ecclesiasticorum scriptorum, p. 2; Nobilibus atque omni laudis genere cumulatissimis sodalibus ecclesiae Fuldensis Ioannes Sichardus. S., pp. 3-4; Memorabilium rerum, quas Philo passim tractat, Index, pp. 5-8.—Numbered pages: Philonis Iudaei Antiquitatum Biblicarum Liber incerto interprete, pp. 1-60; Philonis Iudaei Quaestionum et Solutionum in Genesin Liber, pp. 61-83; Philonis Iudaei Liber De Statu Essaeorum, id est monachorum, qui temporibus Agrippae regis monasteria sibi fecerunt, pp. 84-87; Divi Hieronymi Presbyteri in Librum Philonis Iudaei De Nominibus Hebraicis Praefatio, p. 88; Philonis Iudaei De Nominibus Hebraicis Novi et Veteris Testamenti Liber, Divo Hieronymo interprete, pp.



88–125; Gulielmus Budaeus Iacobo Tusano S., p. 126; Philonis Iudaei Liber De Mundo, Gulielmo Budaeo interprete, pp. 127–142. — Unnumbered pages: one page blank; last page: signet of Adam Petrus different from that used on title page; at the right: “Nun quid non verba mea sunt quasi ignis, dicit dominus et quasi malleus conterens petram?” at the left: “οὐκ ἰδοὺ οἱ λόγοι μου, ὥσπερ πῦρ φλέγον λέγει κύριος, καὶ ὡς πέλυξ κόπτων πέτραι”; in the upper space: “הלא כה דברי כאש נאם-יהוה וכפטיש יפוצץ סלע” [Jeremiah, 23:29]; in the lower space: Excudebat Basileae Adamus Petrus, mense Augusto, Anno M. D. XXVII.

Copies located: Professor Louis Ginzberg, New York City; Mr. Howard L. Goodhart, New York City; Andover-Harvard Library of the Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge, Mass.

Bibliography: Howard L. Goodhart and Erwin R. Goodenough, *A General Bibliography of Philo Judaeus*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938), No. 445.

## II

### REPRINTS

- [2] *Philonis Iudaei Alexandrini, (cuius doctrinae et orationis sublimitatem grauissimi auctores etiam ipsi diuino Platoni aequarunt) omnes quae apud Graecos et Latinos extant, libri, Antiquitatum. Quaestionum et solutionum in Genesin. De Essaeis. De nominibus Hebraicis. De Mundo.*

Basileae per Henricum Petrum.

Collation: 8°. 12 unnumbered pages (sign. a3, b, b2); pp. 1–253; 3 unnumbered pages.

Contents: Unnumbered pages: title page, p. 1; blank, p. 2; Hieronymus in catalogo ecclesiasticorum scriptorum, pp. 3–4; [Sichardus' Preface omitted]; Memorabilium rerum, quas Philo passim tractat, Index, pp. 5–12. — Numbered pages: Philonis Iudaei Antiquita-

tum biblicarum liber incerto interprete, pp. 1-107; Philonis Iudaei Quaestionum et solutionum in Genesin Liber, pp. 108-148; Philonis Iudaei Liber De Statu Essaeorum, id est, monachorum, qui temporibus Agrippae regis monasteria sibi fecerunt, pp. 149-155; Divi Hieronymi Presbyteri in Librum Philonis Iudaei de nominibus Hebraicis Praefatio, pp. 156-157; Philonis Iudaei De Nominibus Hebraicis Noui et Veteris testamenti liber, diuo Hieronymo interprete, pp. 157-221; Gulielmus Budaeus Iacobo Tusano S., pp. 222-223; Philonis Iudaei Liber De Mundo, Gulielmo Budaeo interprete, pp. 224-251; Philonis Iudaei ex Ioanne Tritenheimio Abbate Spanheimense, [bio-bibliographical note on Philo], pp. 252-253. — Unnumbered pages: Basileae per Henricum Petrum, mense Martio, Anno M. D. XXXVIII, back of p. 253; blank, p. 255; signet of Henricus Petrus, identical with that used on the title page of the Basle edition of 1527, with no motto added, p. 256.

C o p y l o c a t e d: Professor Alexander Marx, New York City.

B i b l i o g r a p h y: Goodhart-Goodenough, No. 446. — Joannes Baptista Aucher, *Philonis Iudaei Paralipomena Armena* (Venice, 1826), p. 362, note 1; p. 443, note 2.

N o t e: This edition of the *Antiquitates Biblicae* is a literal reprint of the Basle edition of 1527. Sichardus' marginal notes were also reprinted as marginal notes, but three of them have been omitted (on p. 24, corresponding to p. 8 of the *editio princeps*: "Diluvium non fuisse generale videtur dicere"; on p. 58, corresponding to p. 33: "Iabel qui alias Iabis in Iudicum libris appellatur"; and on p. 94, corresponding to p. 52: "Deut. 22"). Otherwise, the changes are insignificant: a few printing errors in the edition of 1527 are corrected; some new printing mistakes appear. The following remark by Aucher, *op. cit.*, p. 362, note 1, shows that this edition was rare as early as the beginning of the nineteenth century:

"... D. Petrus Pasini habuerit apud se libellum inepta forma et typis editum Basileae A. D. MDXXXVIII casu repertum inter libellos tamquam nullius pretii, qui venales in via prostabant (quam inaniter forsitan quis perquireret in publicis Bibliothecis)..."

- [3] "Philonis Iudaei antiquitatum liber, quaestionum et solutionum in Genesin liber, liber de statu Essaeorum i. e. Monachorum, qui temporibus Agrippae regis monasteria sibi fecerunt; de nominibus hebraicis N. et V. Testamenti liber, latine," in *Μικροπρεσβυτικον, Mikropresbutikon, Veterum quorundam breuium Theologorum, sive Episcoporum, sive Presbyterorum.*

Basileae, apud H. Petri, 1550.

Collation: 2°. Pp. 295-388.

Copy located: British Museum. Not available to the author. Title was taken from Goodhart-Goodenough, No. 448.

Bibliography: Goodhart-Goodenough, No. 448.

- [4] "Philonis Iudaei Antiquitatum Biblicarum Liber. Incerto interprete," in *Antiquitatum Variarum Autores, Quorum catalogum sequens continet pagella.* Apud Seb. Gryphium. Lugd. [Lyons] M. D. LII.

Collation: 16mo. Pp. 84-245.

Contents: Divus Hieronymus in Catalogo Ecclesiasticorum Scriptorum, pp. 84-85; Philonis Iudaei Antiquitatum Biblicarum Liber. Incerto interprete, pp. 86-245.

Copies located: Mr. Howard L. Goodhart, New York City; Hebrew Union College Library, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Bibliography: Goodhart-Goodenough, No. 449; they mention "another edition, *ibidem* [Lyons], 1560," which was not available to the author.

Note: This edition, Lyons, 1552, is a literal reprint of the Basle edition of 1527, as already indicated by the title. Sichardus' marginal notes are omitted.



- [5] "Philonis Iudaei Antiquitatum Biblicarum Liber, Incerto interprete," in *Historia Antiqua hoc est... Philonis Iudaei Antiquitatum Biblicarum Liber. Accessit Censura Gasperis Varrerii in Berosum Ab eruditis pridem desiderata*. Ex Bibliopolio Commeliniano. Anno MDXCIX. [Heidelberg]. [Edited by Iuda Bonutius].

C o l l a t i o n : 8vo. Pp. 41-118; 2 unnumbered pages.

C o n t e n t s : [The biographical sketch, *Hieronymus in catalogo ecclesiasticorum scriptorum*, is omitted]. Philonis Iudaei Antiquitatum Biblicarum Liber, Incerto interprete, pp. 41-118; two additional pages are unnumbered and blank.

C o p y l o c a t e d : Mr. Howard L. Goodhart, New York City.

B i b l i o g r a p h y : Goodhart-Goodenough, No. 457.

N o t e : This edition is a literal reprint of Sichardus' edition of 1527 at Basle, but the marginal notes are omitted. Emendations occur in a few passages and this has resulted in some singular readings which cannot be verified in any of the extant manuscripts. A few other variant readings agree with the Admont text, but as a rule the text of the reprint of 1599 does not deviate from the *editio princeps*.

## A BRIEF SUPPLEMENT TO THE STANDARD HEBREW DICTIONARIES OF ABBREVIATIONS

By JACOB RADER MARCUS

In the course of his work in the field of late medieval *takkanot*, in Hebrew and in Judaeo-German, the author has collected a number of Hebrew script abbreviations not found in Heilprin's and Händler's standard works. This forms the core of the following list. In order to increase the usefulness of this list the writer has systematically checked the following works for unusual abbreviations and has included them: B. Wachstein, *Die Grabschriften des alten Judenfriedhofes in Eisenstadt*, Vienna, 1922; B. Wachstein, *Die Inschriften des alten Judenfriedhofes in Wien*, 2 vols., Vienna, 1912-1917; A. Landau and B. Wachstein, *Jüdische Privatbriefe aus dem Jahre 1619*, Vienna, 1911; P. Lederer, *Hebraeische und Chaldaeische Abbreviaturen*, Pressburg, 1894; [Zedner] *Catalogue of the Hebrew Books in the Library of the British Museum*, London, 1867; R. Grossman, H. Sachs, M. H. Segal, *Compendious Hebrew-English Dictionary*, Tel-Aviv, 1938; F. C. B. Avé-Lallemant, *Das Deutsche Gaunerthum*, part IV, Leipzig, 1862; I. Taglicht, *Nachlässe der Wiener Juden im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*, Vienna, 1917; [Gottfried Selig] *Lehrbuch zur gründlichen Erlernung der jüdischdeutschen Sprache*, Leipzig, 1792; J. C. Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebraea*, part IV, Hamburg, 1733; Leopold Löwenstein, "Abbreviaturen," in *Festschrift zum Siebzigsten Geburtstage A. Berliner's*, F. a.M., 1903, pp. 255-259; [Seligman Baer] *Seder Abodat Yisrael*, 1937; Simeon Dubnow, *Pinkas Ha-Medinah*, Berlin, 1925; Michael Epstein, *Sefer Kizzur Shene Luhot Ha-Berit*, Sulzbach, 1723; David Kaufmann, *Pinkas K'K Bamberg*, in *Kobez Al Yad*, VII (1896-1897), Berlin; B. Wachstein, *Urkunden und Akten zur Geschichte der Juden in Eisenstadt*, Vienna, 1926. All abbreviations given here have been checked against the two standard works: Meir Heilprin, *Ha-Notarikon*, *Ha-Simonim*, *we-Ha-Kinnuyim*, Wilna,

1912, and G. H. Händler, *Lexikon der Abbreviaturen*, 2nd edition, incorporated in Dalman's, *Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch*, F. a.M., 1922.

In some cases, the abbreviations given in the following list are *substantially* though not exactly the same as those found in Heilprin and Händler, but where there was any difference whatever the abbreviations were added for the convenience of the student. It is not improbable that the compiler has erred in a few instances and has included some abbreviations already found in the standard works. For this he craves the indulgence of the reader and hopes he has compensated for these inclusions by the explanation of some obscure and rare words. The reader is finally warned again that quite a number of the words are Judaeo-German or German, particularly the town names, and should be read as such, and not as Hebrew. The Hebraic spelling of German town names given here is frequently that found in the original sources. Where, however, the town names — and some German common nouns — were not written out, the compiler of this list has spelled them phonetically.





ԴՆ. ԱԼԼԼ.  
 ԴԼԼԼ. ԱԼԼ.  
 ԴՆ. Ա  
 ԴԶԴ ԼԵ.  
 ԴԶՆ Լ  
 ԴԶԶԼ  
 ԴԶ.Լ  
 ԴԶԼ.Ծ  
 ԴԶ,  
 ԴԼԾԼԶԶ.Ը  
 ԴԼԼԼ Զ.Ե  
 ԴՆ. Զ  
 Դ.Լ Ը  
 ԴՆ. Ը  
 ԼԼԼԶԶԼ.ԸԾ  
 ԴԼԼԼ. ԸԼԼԼ.ԼԼԼԼԶԶ.ԸԼԼ  
 Դ. ԸԼԼՆ. Զ  
 Դ.Լ. ԼԼ. ԶԸԼԼ  
 Դ.Լ ԶԼԼ  
 ԴՆ. Զ  
 ԴԼ.Ը. ԼԼԼԶԶ.  
 ԴՆ.Ն.  
 ԴԼ.ԸԼ. Ը.Ծ. ԼԼԼ.Ծ  
 ԴԼ.Լ. Ը  
 ԴԼ.ԸԼ. Ը.Ծ. ԼԼԼ.Ծ  
 ԴԼԼԼ.Ծ. ԶԼԸ ԼԼԼԸ  
 ԴՆ.Լ  
 ԴԼ. ԼԼԼ  
 ԴԼԼ. ԼԼ  
 ԴՆ.  
 Դ ԼԼ ԶԼ ԼԼ. ԸԶԼ  
 ԴԼՆ. Ը.Ծ  
 Դ.ԾԼԼԼ  
 ԴԼԼԼԼԼԼԼԼԼԼԼԼ  
 ԴՆ.Ը  
 ԴԼԼ.Ծ  
 ԴԼԼԼ  
 ԴԼԼ.Լ,

[illegible]

בבהכ"ח  
 בבית הכנסת החדשה  
 בבהכ"י  
 בבית הכנסת ישנה  
 בב"ח  
 בעלי בתים חשובים  
 בב"כ  
 בא באי כחו  
 בג'  
 ב' גדולים  
 בשלשה  
 בת גיל  
 בג'  
 בגין  
 בג"ה  
 במזירת המקום  
 בג"ח  
 בג' חגרים  
 בג' חדשים  
 בגמילות חסדים  
 בג"י  
 בג' ימים  
 בג"כ  
 בגין כתב  
 בג"ע  
 בג' עדים  
 בגע"א  
 בגן עדן אמן  
 בג"פ  
 בג' פעמים  
 בג' פשיטין  
 בג"צ  
 בגין צדיקים  
 בג"ק  
 בגין קדושים  
 בג"ר  
 במזירת רבנים  
 בגין רשעים

אש"ט  
 ארנשטיין  
 אש"ל  
 אכילה, שתייה, לינה  
 אשפ"ה  
 אומענוזס, שנייטאך, פורט,  
 היטענבאך  
 א"ת  
 אל תאמר  
 ב'  
 ביעריש  
 ב"א  
 ב' אמות  
 בן אחותי  
 בן איסרל  
 ברוך אלהים  
 בא"ז  
 באגרת זאת  
 בא"ח  
 באסרו חג  
 בא"נ  
 באיש נאמן  
 בא"ע  
 באל עליון  
 בא"ק  
 בן אברהם קצב  
 בא"ש  
 באל שדי  
 בן אברהם שמעון  
 ב"ב  
 בוך בינדער  
 ביקעבורג  
 בלבורין  
 בלומבעריג  
 בן ברוך  
 בעלביר





ב"י  
 ביום טוב  
 בני ישיבה  
 ב"ד  
 ביום ד'  
 ב"ד"צ  
 בית דין צדק  
 ב"ה  
 בית הכנסת  
 בן יונה  
 בן יעקב ה"ט  
 ב"ח  
 בן יצחק חתן  
 ב"ח"ר  
 בית חרשת  
 בי"מ"ס  
 בית מסחר ספרים  
 בי"מ"ש  
 בית משפט  
 ב"ק  
 בן יעקב קופל  
 ב"ב  
 בא כחו, באי כחו, כחם  
 בן כהר"ר  
 בן כמר  
 בעל כרחו  
 בת כהר"ר  
 בת כמר  
 בכ'  
 בכחב  
 בן כבוד  
 בכא"ה  
 בכל אופן המועיל יותר  
 בכו"ה  
 בבח והרשאה  
 בכ"ה  
 בכנסת יראי השם

בזב"ל"ג  
 בזה בורר לו ג'  
 בזמ"ה  
 בזמן הזה  
 בזמ"פ  
 בזמן פרעון  
 בזמ"ק  
 בזמן קבוע  
 ב"ח  
 ב' חגריים  
 בני חטי  
 בן חביב  
 בח'  
 בחדש  
 בחיים  
 בח"ה"מ  
 בחול המועד  
 בחתימת המלך  
 בח"ה"ע  
 בחתימת העדה  
 בחתימת העדים  
 בחתימת העצה  
 בחו"ק  
 בחופה וקדושין  
 בח"ז  
 בחלק זה  
 בחז"ל  
 בדברי חכמינו זכרונם לברכה  
 בח"ל  
 בן חיים ליב  
 בח"מ  
 בחתימת מטה  
 בח"ע  
 בחתימת עדים כשרים  
 ב"ט  
 בן טודרוס  
 בט'  
 בטהרה

במ"י צ  
 בני מדינה ישמרם צורם  
 במ"מ  
 במיתה משנה  
 במכת מרדות  
 במ"ע  
 במקומו עומד  
 במע"ט  
 במעשים טובים  
 במ"ש  
 במה שכתב  
 במקום שבועה  
 במת"י  
 במתנת יד  
 בנ"ד  
 בענין נזכר דנא  
 בנ"ז  
 בנדון זה  
 בנ"ק  
 בנקיטת חפץ  
 ב"ס  
 בן סענדר  
 בעלי סכום  
 בעל סנן  
 בס'  
 בסרור  
 בסוד  
 בסוף  
 בס"ג  
 בעלי סכום גדול  
 בסי'  
 בסיון  
 בס"נ  
 בסכנת נפש  
 בס"ע  
 בספירת עומר  
 בספ'  
 בספק

בכי"מ  
 ברוך כבוד ד' ממקומו  
 בכ"ר  
 בן כבוד רבי  
 בכ"ש  
 בכל שנה  
 ב"ל  
 ב' לטראות  
 ב' למאה  
 בן לב  
 בן ליזר  
 בל"ה  
 בלאו הכי  
 בל"חי  
 בלא חתימת יד  
 בל"ט  
 בלשון טומאה  
 בל"כ  
 בן ליב כהן  
 בל"ש טח  
 בלא שטר חוב  
 ב"מ  
 ב' מאות  
 בן מהר"ר  
 בעל מלאכה  
 בעלי מעריכים  
 בת מהר"ר  
 במ"ג  
 במתנה נמורה  
 במ"ח  
 בעלי משגיחים  
 במז"ל  
 בר מאיר זכרונו לברכה  
 במ"ט  
 במזל טוב  
 במעלות טובות  
 במט"מ  
 במטה משה



בע"פ	בע"ע
בעזות פנים	בית עולמו
בע"ק	בעל ערך
בעדה קדושה	בע'
בעיר קדוש	בעבור
בעיר קודש	בע"א
בעת קדוש	בעזרת אנשים
בעת קודש	בעל אחר
בע"שק	בע"ד
בערב שבת קדוש	בעלי דבר
בע"ת	בעלי דין
בעל עולת חמיר	בע"ה
בעלי תקנות	בעולם הזה
בע"תב	בעל עמק המלך
בערב תשעה באב	בענין הזה
ב"פ	בע"ה
ב' פנים	באנו על החתום
בפ"א	בע"ה
בפעם אחר	באו, באנו על החתום
בפרוטה אחרונה	בע"הי
בפא"ה	בעשרת הימים
בפתיחת ארון הקודש	בע"חמ
בפ"הח	בעדים חתומים מטה
בפני פרנס החודש	בע"יט
ב"ק	בערב יום טוב
בגדי קודש	בע"יכ
בן קופל	בערב יום כפור
בק"ש	בע"מ
בורגנשטאדט	בערבון מוגבל
ברא"ה	בע"נ
ברשות אומות העולם	בעזרת נשים
ברא"ס	בע"ס
בן ר' אברהם סגל	בעלי סכומים
ברא"ש	בערב סוכות
בראש (שם עצם פרטי)	בע"ע
בר"ב	בעבר עברי
בן רבי בער	בעת עתה
בן רבי ברוך	

בר"ש ש	ברד"ח
בן רבי שבתי שעפטל	בן ר' דוד חתן
ב"ש	בר"ו
באכשטיין	בן ר' וואלף
בן שלמה	בר"ז
בן שמחה	בן ר' זליג
בני שמואל	בר"י
בעל שליש	בן ר' יעקב
בעל שם	בן ר' יצחק
בר שמחה	ברי'
בר ששת	ברשות ישראל
בשר"א ובח"ח	ברי"ס
בשבועה דאורייתא ובחרם חמור	בן ר' יצחק סגל
בש"ה	ברי"ק
בשבוע הבא	בן ר' יעקב קופל
בשבוע העבר	ברד"ק
בשבת הבא	בן רבי ליב קאלישר
בשבת העבר	בר"מ
בש"ו ש	בן רבי מענדל
בששון ושמחה	בן ר' משה
ב"ש טח	ברמ"ד
בעל שטר חוב	בן ר' משה דיין
בשטר חוב	ברמ"ל
בש"ע	בן רבי מיכאל ליזר
בשלחן ערוך	בר"נ
ב"ת	בן ר' נחמן
בעל, בעלי תיבה	ברצון נפשו
בעלי תקנות	בר"ק
בתיו"ט	בן רבי קלמן
בעל תוספות יום טוב	בר"ש
בתמ'	ברבי שאול
בתמו	ברוח שטות
בתנ"ז	ברוח שלום
בתנאי זה	בן רבי שלמה
בת"ע	ברש"ק
בתורת עד	בן ר' שלמה קצב
בת"ש	
בתורת שבועה	

[illegible][illegible]





























[22]

MARCUS















ע"ט	ע"צ"ה
על טור	על צד היתר
ע"כ	על צד הכשרות
עד יום כפור	על צד העבר
ע"מ	עצ"ה"כ
על ידי משולח	על צד הכשרות
עכ"ד"נ	עצ"ה"ע
עם כל דין חוקף נאמנות	על צד היתר עסקא
עכנצב"ה	ע"ק
על כן נשמתו צרורה בצרור החיים	עקורי קהל
ע"ל	ע"ר
ענגלענדר	עם רשע
על"ט	ע"ר"ר
עבר עלינו לטובה	עד רום רקיע
ע"מ	ע"ש
על מצות	על שום
עלילת ממזר	על שמו
עקין מריק	עלילת שקר
עמ"ש	עפשטיין
עד מאה שנה	ע' ש' ט' ש' ב' ע' א'
עמשל"פ	עם שאר טהורים שבגן עדן אטן
עד מנת שלא לקבל פרס	עש"צ
ענ"ד	עם שאר צדיקים
ענין נוכר דנה	עש"ק מן שה"ג
ע"ס	ערב שבת קדוש מן שבת הגדול
ע"יין סוף	ע"ז
ע"ע	על תנאי זה
עולמי עד	פ'
עת עתה	פה
עפ"ג	פער
על פי גורל של ג' כשרים	פפעניג
עפ"ר	פרימו
על פי רוב	פרנסים
עפ"פ	פ"א
על פי פקודת	פעם אחרת
עפ"ק	פ"ב
על פי קוויט	פארין כך









L, ԹԵՆԳ ԵՒ  
 L Թ՝Ե  
 L, ԹԵՄԵՆ ԵՒՈ ԵԼ ՏԵ.  
 L ԹԵ՝Ն  
 L ԹԼ ԹՈՒԵԼ  
 L ԹԹԻԳԼ  
 L ՝Թ  
 LԵԼ ԼԵԼԵՄ  
 L ՝Լ  
 ԹՈՒԼ ԽԻՇԽԼԵԺ  
 L, ԺՆԵԳ  
 L Թ ԺԼԳ  
 L ՝Ժ  
 L ԽԻՇԽԼԵ  
 L ՝Տ  
 L, ԼԵԼԵԹԳԼ  
 L, Ե.ԵԳ  
 L ԽԻՇԽԳԼ  
 L ՝Ե  
 L, ԴԼԼԵԳ  
 L ՝Դ  
 L ԽԵԹ ԵՒԵ  
 L Ե՝Ե  
 L ԵՒ ԴՍԵ.  
 L ՝Ե  
 L, ԹՈՒԼ ԹԵԳ  
 L Զ՝Զ  
 LԵ. ԶԵԼ ԽԵԼ  
 L, ԶԵԼ ԽԵԼԼ  
 L Զ՝Ն  
 LԵ ԶԵԼ  
 L, ԶԼԼԵ.  
 L, ԶԻՇԼԳ  
 LԵ ԶԼԼԵ  
 L ՝Զ  
 L, Գ.Ե ԹԵԳ  
 L Զ՝Զ  
 L, ԳԼԼԵ.

[illegible]



שמעב"ל	ש"ז
שמעבר לרף	שבת זכר
שמעה"ז	שטר זכר
שמעולם הזה	ש"ח
שמ"ק	שוהט חזן
שמאלקולדן	שחה"מ שם
שנ"ח	שבת חול המועד של סוכות
שנשאר חייב	שחה"פ
שנ"ל	שבת חול המועד של פסח
שנראה לי	ש"ט
שנפ'	שמועה טובה
שנפלה	שט"מ
שסח"ה	שטר מתנה
שריפה, סקילה, חנק, הרג	שט"ע
ש"ע	שבעה טובי עיר
שארי ענינים	שט"ר
שנות עולמים	שטאט ריכטר
ש"פ	שטוהל ריכטר
שטר פצוי	שט"ש
שפ"ק	שטאט שולץ
שושן פורים קטן	שטאט שרייבר
ש"ק	שי"ד
שבועה קלה	שיש להשיב למקשה
שק"ו	שיש לחרוץ
שבת קודש	שי"נ
ש"ש	שיאיר נרו
שא שלום	שכ"תני
שטאט שופט	שכתבו תנאים
ש"ת	ש"ל
שמא תימא	שומר לילה
ש'ת'	ש"ל"ש
שתחיו	שלום שלום
שתח'ו	ש"מ
שתלמיד חכם	שחיתה מעות
שתי'	שליח מיוחד
שתחיה	שניר מאכיר
	שפל מעות



# ON THE DATE OF APPEARANCE OF THE FIRST PRINTED HEBREW BOOKS\*

by MOSES MARX

It is not known when Gutenberg first conceived the idea of producing books by the process which we call printing, nor when he began work on the practical realization of his idea. The earliest date when he is known to have been active in the development of his invention is the year 1436.<sup>1</sup> At Mainz, in 1445, he is supposed to have produced the oldest known specimen of a printed text, the fragment of the "Weltgericht;"<sup>2</sup> the high point of perfection he reached in the "Gutenberg Bible," finished in 1456;<sup>3</sup> and with the publication of the Mainz Psalter, in 1457, by Gutenberg's successors Johann Fust and Peter Schoeffer, the invention of printing may be said to have come of age.<sup>4</sup> At this time (and not subsequently — as has been assumed — in the confusion attendant upon the capture of Mainz by the soldiers of Adolph of Nassau, in October, 1462), the days of printing as a secret process came to an end, and likewise the restriction of the art to the town of Mainz. Johann Mentelin established his *Strassburg* press in 1458, and Albert Pfister followed him in

\*From volume 1 of my work largely completed in manuscript: History and annals of hebrew printing in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

English translation by Imanuel Marx, to whom I wish to express my thanks and appreciation. My gratitude is also due to Mrs. Fanny Berg, my co-worker for more than twenty years, for her never-failing help. Furthermore I wish to thank Mr. Isaac Goldberg for proof reading.

<sup>1</sup> O. W. Fuhrmann, "The invention of printing," in: *A history of the printed book* . . . ed. by Lawrence Wroth. New York, 1938, p. 41-42. (I am relying on this as the most recent work known to me that summarizes the known dates in Gutenberg's life).

<sup>2</sup> l. c., p. 50.

<sup>3</sup> l. c., p. 49.

<sup>4</sup> l. c., p. 52.



*Bamberg* not later than 1460.<sup>5</sup> The first book produced outside of Germany appeared in *Italy* about 1462.<sup>6</sup> *Switzerland* followed in 1464,<sup>7</sup> the *Netherlands* began at the same time or a little later,<sup>8</sup> *France* started in 1470,<sup>9</sup> *Spain*<sup>10</sup> and *Hungary*<sup>11</sup> in 1473, *Poland* in 1474,<sup>12</sup> and *England* in 1476.<sup>13</sup> Somewhat later, the roster of nations printing during the fifteenth century was completed by *Denmark* in 1482, *Sweden* in 1483,<sup>14</sup> *Portugal* in 1487,<sup>15</sup> *Montenegro*<sup>16</sup> and *Turkey* in 1493.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>5</sup> E. von Rath, "The spread of printing in the fifteenth century," in: *A history of the printed book* . . . ed. by Lawrence Wroth. New York, 1938, p. 59.

<sup>6</sup> Conrad Haebler, *Die Erfindung der Druckkunst und ihre erste Ausbreitung in den Ländern Europas*. Mainz, Gutenberg-Gesellschaft, 1930, p. 16. See also: Haebler, *Die italienischen Fragmente vom Leiden Christi; das älteste Druckwerk Italiens*. Munich, J. Rosenthal, 1927; and: Jacques Rosenthal, *Seltene Drucke* . . . Catalogue 87. Munich, 1927, no. 134, which offers the fragment in question together with a short description and the basis for its dating.

<sup>7</sup> v. Rath, l. c., p. 65; Roland M. McKerrow, *An introduction to bibliography* . . . 2d. impression. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1928, p. 272.

<sup>8</sup> Haebler, l. c., p. 17; v. Rath, l. c., p. 77. An exact date for the first book printed in the Netherlands cannot be given, since the first books printed there give neither date nor place of origin.

<sup>9</sup> Haebler, l. c., p. 18; v. Rath, l. c., p. 74.

<sup>10</sup> Haebler, l. c., p. 19; v. Rath, l. c., p. 76. Haebler, p. 20, says of the origin of the printers in Spain: "Auch über Spanien hat sich dann die neue Kunst rasch verbreitet; zu den deutschen Meistern sind sehr zeitig solche spanischer Nationalität, später sogar auch Franzosen getreten." v. Rath says: "Printing in Spain and Portugal likewise owes its beginnings to German enterprise." The comment of Dr. Joshua Bloch (in his work *Early Hebrew printing in Spain and Portugal*. New York, The N. Y. Public Library, 1938, p. 5): "Printing in general was introduced into Spain directly from Italy . . ." can hardly be maintained in view of the foregoing facts; he himself even continues: "As in other parts of Europe, the early printers of Spain and Portugal were mostly Germans . . . who had migrated from their native land . . ."

<sup>11</sup> v. Rath, l. c., p. 80.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> Haebler, l. c., p. 20; v. Rath, l. c., p. 79-80.

<sup>14</sup> Haebler, l. c., p. 21; v. Rath, l. c., p. 68.

<sup>15</sup> As to the beginnings of printing in Portugal and Turkey — where the Jews were the first printers and Hebrew the first products of the press — see below.

<sup>16</sup> Haebler, l. c., p. 22.

Since the new art was known at the outset only to the Mainz printers and to their assistants, and since it was carried to the rest of the world by these assistants — that is, by German craftsmen — the Jews of Germany, who were excluded from the crafts, could have no access to printing. During the first stage of the dissemination of the art of printing, therefore, the Jews in Germany were denied all possibility of printing their own books. Furthermore, despite the never-ending emigration to the South, they were in no position to communicate the art of printing in Hebrew to the Jews of Italy and Spain; these latter could learn the new craft only from wandering German printers or from the Christian printers in the southern countries.

As I shall attempt to show, Hebrew printing in *Italy* began about 1470; in *Spain* the first Hebrew book was published in 1476.<sup>17</sup> Hebrew printing thus began relatively early; in Spain presumably less than three years after the debut of Latin printing in that country. In *Portugal*, as mentioned above, printing began in 1487; the first book was in Hebrew, and ten more Hebrew publications followed before the first non-Hebrew book appeared in December, 1494.<sup>18</sup> In *Turkey*, where, for many years to follow, printing in Turkish or Arabic was prohibited by law, and where during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries only Hebrew presses existed, the first book appeared at Constantinople in 1493, likewise in Hebrew.

It is not surprising that the Jews took so quickly to the new invention. For one thing, their degree of education, one-sided though it may have been, was comparatively high, and respect for the written word rooted far more deeply in their consciousness than among the Gentiles, especially since almost all their literature was religious in nature. Also, while large segments of the

<sup>17</sup> The first book proved to have been printed in Spain (see note 10) appeared in 1473, the first dated Hebrew book in 1476; see: I. Sonne, *Un incunabolo ebraico spagnolo del 1476 nella Bibliotheca Capitolare di Verona*. Firenze, L. S. Olschki, 1937 (Estratto della *Bibliofilia*, v. 39).

<sup>18</sup> R. Proença e A. Anselmo, "Bibliografia dos incunabulos portugueses," in: *Anais das bibliotecas e arquivos. Revista trimestral* . . . v. I. Lisboa, Biblioteca Nacional, 1920, p. 186–191. On page 191 are listed 12 Hebrew, 7 Latin, and 5 Portuguese books printed in Portugal in the fifteenth century.

surrounding population remained illiterate, a great percentage of the Jews were trained in reading and writing, in particular nearly all male Jews. Finally, the continual restraints imposed on the economic activities of the Jews kept them on the lookout for new means of earning a living; in view of their widespread interest in their own literature, a good profit could be expected from the printing business.

\* \* \* \*

The actual beginnings of Hebrew printing are in many respects shrouded in as great a darkness as those of all printing. Many questions in this field are still unsolved, probably will never be solved.

The cradle of Hebrew printing was in Italy. On February 18, 1475, at Reggio di Calabria in the south of Italy, Abraham Ben Garton published the commentary of Rashi on the Pentateuch, the first book which gives the date of its completion. This was followed on July 3 of the same year by the *Arba'a Turim* of Jacob ben Asher, printed in the north, at Piove di Sacco near Padua, by Meshullam Cusi and his sons.

We have become accustomed to find symbolic the fact that the commentary by the great teacher of the diaspora, for centuries the most popular work in Jewish literature, should likewise have been the first Hebrew book printed.<sup>19</sup> Actually it can be assumed as a certainty that work on the Code of Law of Jacob ben Asher, although it was finished four and a half months later, must have begun considerably earlier, since the four stout volumes of the *Turim* comprise far more printed matter than Rashi's Commentary.<sup>20</sup> But concerning both books we must not overlook the fact that they are merely the first *that are dated*. For this reason alone they have hitherto been placed at the head of the chronological list of Hebrew printed books. Another early group however, printed without indication of place or date, the so-called Rome incunabula, has been listed as later publications,

<sup>19</sup> After Zunz, in: *Zeitschrift fuer die Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, 1822-23, p. 349.

<sup>20</sup> A. Marx, in: *The Jewish Theological Seminary: Register 1929-30*. New York, 1929, p. 149.

and no explanation has ever been given — or even attempted — for such an arrangement. This fact is all the more striking since the Rome incunabula, whose date of publication we shall try to determine, are in every way productions of the most primitive sort, so much so that any student unhampered by prejudice would surely be drawn to a careful examination and a critical comparison with other books of the *earliest* period of printing.

The first step towards a reexamination of the chronological sequence of early Hebrew printed books — a reexamination whose results in all probability bring us considerably closer to their actual order of appearance — was taken about 25 years ago by the great collector and connoisseur of Hebrew books, Lazarus Goldschmidt.

The book dealer Ludwig Rosenthal, in Munich, published in 1913 his *Catalogue 151: Hebrew Incunabula: 1475-1496. With 33 facsimiles*. This, the first dealer's catalogue devoted in its entirety to Hebrew incunabula, was very expertly compiled by E. Ettinghausen. Page 21 of the catalogue was given over to L. Goldschmidt<sup>21</sup> for an introduction to the Rome incunabula, and here for the first time he enunciated the theory that these books were of earlier dates of publication than previously assumed. The customary order reads:

1. Reggio di Calabria, 1475
2. Piove di Sacco, 1475
3. Mantua, 1476-1477
4. Ferrara, 1477
5. Rome (?), prior to 1480 (?).<sup>22</sup>

Goldschmidt suggested that the Rome incunabula must be older than those of Conat in Mantua, and the catalogue follows him in assigning to the Rome editions of the Commentary on the Pentateuch by Moses ben Naḥman, and of the Moreh Nebukim, the date "about 1475."

<sup>21</sup> The catalogue lists 49 incunabula in 68 numbers. Ettinghausen and Goldschmidt are not named. Ettinghausen later was the editor of the valuable and well-made catalogues of Maggs Bros. in London.

<sup>22</sup> See: A. Freimann, Ueber hebräische Inkunabeln. Vortrag. Leipzig, 1902. Repr.: *Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, v. 19.



Goldschmidt maintains that the works printed in Rome were of greater importance for the Jews than those produced in Mantua; in consequence he feels that they must have been published earlier. He lists six further reasons, mostly of a technical nature. Since I shall attempt to show that the Rome incunabula precede not only Conat's publications but even those books hitherto accepted as the earliest Hebrew printed books, I shall not need to go further into Goldschmidt's reasons, except that I shall partly draw on them in comparing the Rome incunabula with other early printed books.

In 1462 appeared the first book printed in Italy, but it was an isolated case. In 1465, however, Sweynheym and Pannartz began a long period of printing ventures, first in Subiaco near Rome and then from 1467 on in Rome itself. Starting in January, 1468, several other printing houses began operations in the same city.<sup>23</sup> Hence, though denied the honor of sheltering the earliest press in Italy, Rome is the city where Italian printing had its first real development. To establish a connection between the early development of printing in Rome and the origin of the Hebrew Rome incunabula has not previously been attempted.

The first question to be answered is whether the place of origin of these incunabula is really Rome, since, as stated above, no indication is given in the books themselves. No place of origin is assigned by De-Rossi, Steinschneider, or Zedner. Schwab<sup>24</sup> is the first to mention Rome. No. 13 in his bibliography, the Commentary on the Pentateuch of Moses ben Naḥman, is dated "s. l. n. d. (Italie (?) Rome, avant 1480);" based, no doubt, on the short colophon of the book: "נעחק ע' עובדיה ומנשה ובנימין מרומא" "Copied by Obadiah and Manasseh and Benjamin of Rome." Actually this states merely that the printers (or perhaps only the last) came from Rome or made

<sup>23</sup> See: *Cat. of books printed in the xvth century now in the Brit. Museum*, pt. 4.

<sup>24</sup> Joh. Bernardus De-Rossi, *Annales hebraeo-typographici sec. xv*. Parma, 1795. M. Steinschneider, *Catalogus librorum hebraeorum in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*. Berlin, 1852-1860. [Joseph Zedner], *Catalogue of the Hebrew books in the Library of the British Museum*. [London], 1867. Moïse Schwab, *Les incunables orientaux* . . . Paris, 1883.

their residence there. Schwab makes no attempt to find the place of origin of the other books in this group.<sup>25</sup>

As is well known, the Roman origin of at least one of these books was first established in 1896 by D. Simonsen, in the jubilee volume of M. Steinschneider, p. 166. Simonsen had found, in the... ווינטורצו... שמואל... שנתן הגט שנתן... published at Venice in 1566, leaf 16c, a reference to a treatise on divorce found in responsum 396 of Solomon ben Adret: בחשובותי הנדפסות ברומי "in his responses that were printed at Rome". This responsum, however, is found with the stated number only in the first edition of the work, one of our Rome incunabula. Simonsen closes with the words, "We have thus an ancient witness to the fact that this edition was printed at Rome. Presumably the same is then true of the Nahmanides edition, produced by three Romans, and of the other works printed with the same square type." His opinion was accepted by D. Chwolson,<sup>26</sup> and by A. Freimann in his *Vortrag ueber Hebraeische Inkunabeln*, in 1902. Bernhard Wachstein, in *Bibliothek der Israelitischen Kultus-gemeinde Wien, Katalog der S. Cohn'schen Schenkungen*, II, Vienna, 1914, follows three of these incunabula with the comment: "[Rome (?) before 1480]."<sup>27</sup>

Since Simonsen's fortunate and interesting discovery, the place of origin of these books has been given as Rome — though with question marks — by all bibliographers, except for Siegmund Seligmann. The latter, in *Z. f. h. B.*, v.7, 1903, p.25, attempted to prove from the alleged printer's colophon for the Roman edition of the Shorashim that the book could not have been printed in Rome. He was, however, in error: the colophon has

<sup>25</sup> He again gives Rome as place of origin, however, for the first edition of the Mishneh Torah, although the style of the type used here is entirely different; the reason is presumably because, as in the Ramban, one of the printers has the name Obadiah — here, however, with the addition of the patronymic *ben Moses*. The book was later listed among the Rome incunabula by Chwolson (see next note) and by Freimann, l. c.

<sup>26</sup> *Reshit Ma'aseh ha-Defus be-Yisrael*. Warsaw, 1897, p. 31–32.

<sup>27</sup> See nos. 13, 290, 300. The omission of the question marks in nos. 13 and 290 is undoubtedly a typographical error; cf. the geographical index, p. 173, where the place-name Rome for these numbers is followed by a question mark.

no bearing on the time or place of printing, since it was written by the author and not by the printer, and is found in the manuscripts of the work.<sup>28</sup>

Seligmann again denies the Roman origin of these books in his review of the previously mentioned Wachstein catalogue, *Z. f. h. B.*, v. 17, 1914, p. 14. He refers to the above mentioned colophon and adds further "that we are after all well informed about the contemporary history of the Jews in Rome, and it would be very strange if we could find no reference to a printing house there that produced such a relatively large number of important works."

The date of origin "ante 1480," first given by *De-Rossi* in his *Annales*, has been used by all later writers. Only Schwab, in dating the Moreh Nebukim edition (no. 8), refers to the date given for the preceding number (no. 7), a Conat edition, as "entre 1475 et 1480," while Chwolson assumes, since the entire series was completed "before 1480," that the Moreh Nebukim, which he believes to have been the first of the series, must have appeared as early as 1476 or 1477.<sup>29</sup>

The final and most valuable support for our investigation of the origin of the Rome incunabula was furnished by A. Marx,<sup>30</sup> in his review of the previously cited Rosenthal catalogue. He notes that the unusually tall and broad pages, printed in single column, found in the first Hebrew folios — the Naḥmanides, 'Aruk, and Shorashim — were used almost exclusively by the earliest Christian printers in Rome for their Latin publications. In other Italian cities the same wide column is found in some of the earliest books produced there during the dawn of printing.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>28</sup> I. Sonne, "Druckwesen," in: *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, v. 6, p. 41.

<sup>29</sup> I.c., p. 32, apparently again after Schwab. His reasons for ascribing the rights of the first-born to the Moreh Nebukim may with equal justification be brought forth in favor of any one of the Rome incunabula.

<sup>30</sup> *JQR*, NS, v. 11, 1920-21, p. 105.

<sup>31</sup> See: *Cat. of books printed in the xvth century now in the Brit. Museum*, pt. 6. This format is found with some frequency prior to 1472 only in Venice, but accompanied by far more quartos than in Rome from the start. But Venice is out of the question as a place of origin for Hebrew books in this period, since the Jews were at the time prohibited from residing in that city.

Nowhere, however, was this format used so consistently and for so long a time as among the printers of Subiaco and Rome, who in the period from 1465 to 1472 seldom set their type in other forms.

I may be permitted to support this point with some statistical data taken from the catalogue of Roman incunabula in the British Museum, a collection which would seem to offer a good cross-section of early Roman printing. Of 106 books printed in Latin at Rome prior to 1474, 78, i. e. more than two thirds, are in folio. Of these folio editions, 54, again more than two thirds, are printed in single column. The remaining 24 two-column folios are distributed chronologically as follows:

only 1 in 1467  
only 2 in 1468-70  
only 3 in 1471  
9 in 1472  
9 in 1473.

We list also the distribution by printers: *Sweynheym and Pannartz*, the pioneers in Subiaco and Rome, contribute 40 books printed between 1465 and 1472; among them 35 single-column folios, one double-column folio, and four quartos; three more books in 1473, all in folio, two of them single-column and the third and last in double column.

The second printer, *Ulrich Han*, preferred quartos from the beginning. For the years 1468-1472, the British Museum catalogue lists 18 of his imprints, including only five folios. The two earlier are in single column, the three later, 1471 and 1472, are already in double column; nevertheless, in his folios produced between 1473 and 1478 Han still printed both in double and in single column.

*Sixtus Riesinger*, 1468-1470, is represented by four books, two octavos and two folios — both the latter in double column.

*Joannes Philippus de Lignamine* contributes eight books for the period 1470-1472, all single-column folios; for 1473-1474 he has 12 books, six in quarto, six single-column folios.

There are three books listed for *Georgius Lauer* in 1470, all single-column folios. Four quartos are listed for 1471; for 1472



there are four folios, the earliest in single column and the later three in double column. Almost all succeeding folios up to 1480 are in double column.

*Adam Rot* has two octavos for 1471 and four folios for 1472, all in double column.

To summarize: we find that all printers who began their work under the influence of Sweynheym and Pannartz in Rome before 1471 showed a definite preference for a wide folio column on leaves about 40 cm. tall. In consequence we are led to believe that the Hebrew books showing the same distinctive characteristics, one of them listing three Romans as printers and another proved by an independent quotation to have been printed at Rome, were likewise produced at Rome during the same period.

As we see, the unusually wide column and the very large dimensions of these books, not only give confirmation of Rome as their place of origin; they also furnish the first clue as to their date of publication, a clue that points to a very early time. I find it impossible to believe that the Jewish printers chose this exceptionally broad and tall format merely because they had seen one or two Latin books made up similarly;<sup>32</sup> rather I should expect them to have imitated the format which they had seen produced time and again by their printing master — which, indeed, they had in all probability *themselves helped to produce*. Hence I believe that the printing of these Hebrew books must fall into the period when the broad folio page of Sweynheym and

<sup>32</sup> The Roman middle classes of the time had in general little interest in science or literature, and the new printing industry found few customers other than the clergy in the city itself. (A. W. Pollard, in: *Cat. of books printed in the xvth century now in the Brit. Museum*, pt. 4, p. xvi. See also: Gregorovius, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom*, passim). Therefore we can hardly assume that the Jews of the Roman ghetto in their commercial contacts with Christians had frequent opportunity — if any — of examining printed books. On the other hand, the sensational news of the great innovation in the manufacture of books must, after the transfer of the first printing office from Subiaco to Rome, have spread through the town with rapidity and even reached the Jews, some of the curious among whom surely visited the new shop. (Cf. Bomberg's remark in his first colophon, to the Haftarat in 1516, about the numerous visitors to his new print shop in Venice).

Pannartz was still the standard form for the Roman presses, i. e. not later than 1472, and that our printers — or at least one of them — must have served an apprenticeship at Rome, in one of the two earliest printing offices, under either Sweynheym and Pannartz or Ulrich Han.<sup>33</sup>

The Rome incunabula fall into three series, which I shall investigate in more detail later. Of the two older series, the first comprises two large single-column folios, one quarto, and one octavo; the second contains one large single-column folio and one octavo. Very likely the production of these books extended over several years, for we find that all Hebrew print shops of the fifteenth century took longer to bring forth their works than the Christian printers. Since the printing of these two series, as shown by a comparison with the Latin books of similar size produced in the Roman press, should have ended about 1472, I believe that the enterprise may very well have started as early as 1469–1470, probably even earlier. The third group consists of a small single-column folio and a large double-column folio, that is to say in both cases it represents the more advanced developments of the general Roman press. Hence, once more by analogy with the history of Latin printing in Rome, it may be

<sup>33</sup> "Perhaps an influence of Christian printers might be traced, as it is in itself not unlikely that some of the early Jewish printers may have served their apprenticeship with printers of Latin books," A. Marx, l. c. Joannes Philippus de Lignamine, who began his printing activity somewhat later, could not have been the instructor of the Jewish printers, although he alone remained faithful to the single-column folio until 1476, since not one of his books is in large folio like those of the first Christian and Jewish printers in Rome. His folios are of 27–32 lines, compared to an average of more than 40 lines in the productions of Sweynheym and Pannartz, Ulrich Han, and others. But Lignamine, the "first native printer in Italy," is eliminated from consideration, since he was a member of the aristocracy, in high favor at the papal court during several papacies, and actually not himself a printer, but one who had books printed in his house, and "did not soil his own hands with printer's ink." Craftsmen like Sweynheym and Pannartz or Ulrich Han, who participated in the work of their shops, fit into the picture much better than the papal courtier. They surely may have been induced, for money or other advantages, to teach the Jews the trade of printing, very likely binding them by contract to produce no Latin or Italian books (which in any case would probably have been rapidly suppressed by the Church).

assumed that this series was started not earlier than 1472 or 1473 and completed about 1474 or 1475 (?).

We may derive a further indication of the time of origin of these books from the existence of two blank leaves at the beginning of the previously mentioned Ramban edition.<sup>34</sup> The first products of the Roman press, printed by Sweynheym and Pannartz, generally begin with *one* blank leaf, a sensible precaution to protect the first printed page against soiling while the book was unbound. We frequently find such a blank leaf at the beginning of the books of all Roman printers; yet the number of publications whose text begins on the first page appears to be far greater. Thus, the occurrence of *two* blank initial leaves, for which it is difficult to find a practical explanation, appears even stranger! Even so, the British Museum catalogue of Roman incunabula lists eight books made up in this way by four different printers: two during 1469 and 1470, five in 1472, and one in 1473.<sup>35</sup> After 1473 no such case is noted! It is evident that such an unnecessary provision, used a few times during a short period and then dropped again, could only have been imitated by the Jewish printers *at the same time*, could hardly have been independently invented by them at a later period. This indication also, it seems to me, places the origin of the Ramban between the years 1469 and 1472, already previously determined from other clues.

*And so I believe that these Hebrew books must be regarded as*

<sup>34</sup> The fact that this book has two blank leaves at the beginning is mentioned in none of the bibliographies. Actually it has, not two or three blank leaves as stated in the descriptions, but a total of five: two at the beginning, one at the end of the first part, and two at the end of the whole work, as is proved by the quires and watermarks, although perhaps all the leaves may be extant in no surviving copy.

<sup>35</sup> *Cat. of books printed in the xvth century now in the Brit. Museum*, pt. 4: 1) Justinus, *Epitome*, U. Han, s. a. [1469–70] (p. 19–20). 2) Chrysostomus, G. Lauer, 1470 (p. 36). 3) N. de Lyra, *Postilla*, Sweynheym and Pannartz, 1472: v. 1, the third and last; v. 2, the first and last; v. 3, the first two and last two blank (p. 14–15). 4) Livius, Sweynheym and Pannartz, 1472 (p. 15). 5) Antoninus, *Summa Confessionum*, G. Lauer, 1472 (p. 37). 6) Clemens II, *Constitutiones*, G. Lauer, 1472 (p. 37). 7) F. de Senis, *Disputationes*, A. Rot, 1472 (p. 43). 8) Clemens II, *Constitutiones*, G. Lauer's 2d ed., 1473 (p. 38).

*considerably older than the first dated books issued in 1475, and the first Hebrew press must be sought neither in Reggio di Calabria nor in Piove di Sacco but in the Eternal City, Rome, in the period between 1469 and 1472, in immediate or almost immediate contact with the first printing house established outside Germany.*

\* \* \* \*

The older two of the three series of Hebrew books printed in Rome consist of the following titles. In the first series:

- 1) the Commentary on the Pentateuch by Moses ben Naḥman (Thesaurus Typographiae Hebraicae Saeculi XV, A 20), in which the three partners in the printing firm are mentioned, in large single-column folio;
- 2) the talmudical dictionary 'Aruk by Nathan ben Jehiel, of Rome (A 23), in large single-column folio;
- 3) the Commentary on the Pentateuch by Rashi (A 21) in quarto (of much larger dimension than usual);
- 4) the Commentary on the Book of Daniel by Levi ben Gerson (A 22) in large octavo.

These four books are printed in the identical large Hebrew type of German character,<sup>36</sup> with a bizarre ם which strikes the eye wherever it appears.

The second series comprises:

- 5) the dictionary Sefer ha-Shorashim by David Kimḥi (A 24), in large single-column folio;
- 6) the collection of Responsa by Solomon Ben Adret (A 25), in large octavo, whose Roman origin was proved by Simonsen.

The type in this group is somewhat larger, but the capital letters and the method of printing are the same as in the preceding group. The unusual form of the ם does not appear.

It seems unlikely that the order of publication of these two groups will ever be determined with any degree of certainty. The

<sup>36</sup> One may in consequence assume that the printers were of German origin.



possibility that they come from different printing houses working simultaneously, one of which patterned its type after that of the other, cannot be denied. Still it seems more probable that both series came from the same print shop,<sup>37</sup> since their manner of printing is completely identical, with no distinctions between one group and the other — let alone improvements. From the content of the books, the given sequence would seem to be the correct one; this again would point to their origin from a single press. The return of the letter **ו** to its usual form likewise speaks for this arrangement. Assuming that both series were printed by the same press, the objection might be raised that the smaller type of the first-named series is a sign of progress over the larger type of the second, since the tendency of the early printers was in the direction of smaller type, to effect a saving of paper, which at that time was very expensive.<sup>38</sup> This objection is nullified by the example of the second Roman printing office, that of Ulrich Han, who began with small type but increased the size about 1469 or 1470 (the books from the transition period are undated). If we could assume that the Jewish printers imitated the change instituted by Han, we should have another point in support of our determination of the time of origin; for our assumption would place the change in size of Hebrew type in the period shortly after 1469–1470 — entailing the conclusion that the four books of the older group, printed in smaller type, must have been completed by this time.

<sup>37</sup> The same print shop, not necessarily the same printers. It is of course possible that the enterprise changed hands.

<sup>38</sup> The demand for paper was very small before the invention of printing, and the few paper factories supplying the production of manuscripts naturally were by no means prepared for the tremendous increase in demand brought about by the new invention. "Of these [production expenses of a printed book] . . . the largest outlay was for paper, which is figured to have amounted to about half the total cost of a fifteenth-century book," G. P. Winship, *Gutenberg to Plantin, an outline of the early history of printing*. Cambridge, 1926, p. 18. "Dass ein Drucker, um mit dem Papier zu sparen, das noch im sechszehnten Jahrhundert der teuerste Bestandteil der Herstellung eines Buches blieb, zu Typen von immer kleinerem Kegelmasse . . . überging, wäre verständlich . . ." E. Consentius, *Die Typen der Inkunabelzeit* . . . Berlin. 1929, p. 119.

The third series includes:

- 7) the *Sefer Mizwot Gadol* (SeMaG) by Moses of Coucy (A 19), a large double-column folio, with a woodcut diagram on leaf 134 (A 19,2).
- 8) the *Moreh Nebukim* of Moses ben Maimon (A 18), a small folio in single column;

In the printing of the SeMaG, two different text-types were employed, both identical in character with those used before, but considerably smaller in size. The printer began each of its two parts with a small type, 55 lines of which cover about 26 cm., and finished with a very slightly larger type, 53 lines extending for about 26 ½ cm. Since the *Moreh Nebukim* is printed in the second of these types, it appears to be the later publication.<sup>39</sup>

The capital letters in the books of this group are the same as in the preceding two series. However, there is no indication of their place of origin; clues such as were cited for the preceding groups have not been found. The surmise that they belong to the Roman press is based — already by De-Rossi<sup>40</sup> — on the identity of type-form and of general printing technique alone. While we can therefore assume a Roman origin for these books only with certain reservations, bibliographically speaking we must still class them with the previously listed Rome incunabula. Even if, as seems highly unlikely, they were actually printed elsewhere, these two books are certainly direct and immediate descendants of the first two series.

<sup>39</sup> L. Goldschmidt, *The earliest illustrated Haggadah*. London, 1940, p. 28–29, note 1.

<sup>40</sup> "Locus incertissimus est, atque ego quidem illic verosimilius impressum librum crediderim, ubi prodierunt editiones, quae sequuntur [the other Rome incunabula], quadratae. Eadem omnium ratio, omnes sine anno et loco expressae, omnes caractere quadrato, qui in nostra hoc Kotzensis libro praeceptorum est perfecte idem, in reliquis major quidem, sed ejusdem plane formae, ut dubitandum non videatur, quin eundem habeant artificem, communemque typographum ac locum... Prima dictio, quemadmodum et capitum ac sectionum exordia, majoribus sed aeque antiquis ac rudibus typis exhibentur..." De-Rossi, *Annales*, p. 121. "...fere pro certo tenendum est eas omnes [Rome incunabula] ab iisdem tribus typographis fuisse curatas, et ut Itali ii sunt in Italia prodiisse," l. c., p. 123.

In this group we see the first marks of progress. Two solutions have been tried for the problem of the wide column that looks so impressive but creates difficulties for the reader whenever he comes to the end of a line. In one case the large folio has been replaced by a small folio, automatically shortening the line; in the other, far more practically, the wide column has been replaced by two narrow ones. Furthermore, the inclusion of a woodcut, however crude, shows an increasing ability to adapt to the exigencies of the new art. The most notable improvement over the two older groups is the considerable diminution in the size of type, resulting in the desired saving of paper.

These eight books printed in Rome are actually the most primitive of all the early Hebrew books printed in Italy. The type case of the Jewish printing office in Rome contained only letters, no other marks, not even those of punctuation! Besides the text-type, these printers had a second, larger font of type, of identical design, chiefly for use as initials; the same font was used for this purpose in all books of the three series. This use of initial type was a divergence from the practice of the Christian printers in Rome, who were accustomed to leave blank spaces for the later addition of hand-drawn illuminated initials. Not until about 1470 did the Christian printers begin to use a larger font for initials, without entirely discarding the older usage. Since our printers had no means for adding marks above or below the line, they created a second font of text-type for abbreviations and scriptural quotations, distinguished by a dot added over each letter. Their type case further contained, in both initial and text sizes, a single ligature: a symbol for the combination of נ and ל. This symbol is frequently employed in rabbinical literature, and was probably used by almost all the printers of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, although generally only in the so-called rabbinical type.

Thus we see that the Rome incunabula present the most primitive arrangement of large and crudely formed letters into words, divided into lines and separated by uneven blank spaces to assure flush margins.

The printers of these books, as pioneers, could be well satisfied with their results. After no doubt long and tedious efforts,



accompanied by disappointments and rebuffs, they had finally succeeded in adapting the new method of producing Latin books to those in Hebrew. They had brought into being a method of book production far superior to that previously employed, a method that enormously decreased the cost of books, that permitted the production of hundreds of copies in a short time, above all a method that placed in their hands a new and successful means of livelihood, free, at least at the beginning, of any competition. Primitive or not, they had reached their goal; *their* problem was solved. For the later printers, those of 1475, to whom, as will be shown later, books of the Roman press were already known, the situation was different. The initial difficulties had already been surmounted for them. Their great investment of effort and capital needed to start production was no wild speculation. The superiority and greater marketability of the new books, as compared to manuscripts, had been established. Since, finally, these later printers already had printed books as their model, they could devote their entire efforts to the perfection of the manufacturing processes and the improvement of type styles and type setting — with a measure of success, as the evidence of their productions demonstrates.

Beyond the eight books already listed — as far as is known today — no others were printed during the fifteenth century in Rome, the greatest Jewish community of its time in Italy and indeed the entire western world. Of the causes that brought to a halt the first Jewish printing offices we have no more knowledge than we have of the printers themselves. Whether the reasons were economic in nature, whether the Church began even at this early date to place difficulties in the path of Jewish printing — whatever the cause, it is unknown to us. Certain it is that in the period after the closing of our Jewish printing office in Rome no other Hebrew type was used in that city. When Georgius Lauer, from Würzburg, printed the letters of Hieronymus, at Rome in 1479 he was constrained, for lack of Hebrew type, to leave blank the spaces that should have been filled by Hebrew words.<sup>41</sup> The

<sup>41</sup> *Cat. of books printed in the xvth century now in the Brit. Museum*, pt. 4, p. 39. Lauer also left blank spaces for Greek words.



same expedient had to be employed by Eucharius Silber when he issued, in 1486, the forged letter of "Neumia filius Haccanae."<sup>42</sup>

As we have seen, the Jewish printers in Rome changed the format of their column and the size of their type, but their printing technique, their completely primitive manner of setting the printed page, was maintained unchanged. From the first book to the last — whatever sequence of publication one may accept — all outside influences were resisted. The second Hebrew print shop in Italy, operated by *Meshullam Cusi* and his sons in *Piove di Sacco*, introduced a few improvements; but on the whole their printing technique is so thoroughly based on that created by the Roman printers that it is difficult to see how anyone could have assigned to the Piove di Sacco imprints a date earlier than that of the Rome incunabula.

On July 3, 1475, Meshullam Cusi's sons completed the Turim of Jacob ben Asher in four folio volumes, (Thesaurus A2), printed in double column, like the SeMaG, whose publication may have occurred shortly before that of the Turim. The type used has the German character of the three Roman groups,<sup>43</sup> but is better cut, with the characteristic forms of the style more sharply accented. The capital letters are very slightly larger than the common capital font of all the Roman incunabula; the text-type, however, though in its form it still belongs to the same family, is a novelty in its small size. How great is the reduction in text size can best be indicated by comparing the height of 20 lines of type from each font: Roman series 1: 110 mm.; series 2: 115 mm.; series 3: 101 mm.; Piove: 75 mm. Thus while there is a saving of 14 mm. in comparing series 3 to series 2, the difference between Piove and the smallest Roman type is one of 26 mm.!

<sup>42</sup> l. c., p. 124. In several copies of this book that I have seen, the omitted Hebrew words were added in manuscript, probably at the printing office.

<sup>43</sup> See the *ṣ*, in which the descending line, instead of going more or less straight downward, as usual, turns sharply backwards, to the right, in a striking way. The later Hebrew types in German style, those of Gershom Soncino, of the Prague and Augsburg printers, do not show this peculiarity; but we find it again among those Christian printers in Switzerland, Germany, and in Lyons, who make use of a good type in the German style. The *ḡ* is larger, chiefly below the line, than the other letters.

The ligature used in the Roman press for **לס** appears again in both the Piove fonts of type.

The natural explanation for all these points of similarity can, in my opinion, be found only by assuming that the printers in Piove di Sacco were acquainted with books printed at Rome and that they patterned their work entirely on these books. As *their* contributions beyond the achievements of the Roman printers we may list:

- 1) the considerable reduction in type size, resulting in a great saving of paper;
- 2) the completion of the end of each line with the first letter or letters of the initial word on the next line, resulting in flush margins without the necessity of uneven spacing within the lines;
- 3) the introduction of a special symbol for the divine name, in imitation of the manuscripts, an innovation soon accepted by almost all the printers;
- 4) the creation of a third size of type.

In considering this third type size, which is slightly larger than the text-type of Roman series 3, I find it very remarkable that the printers made no use of the size before the fourth and last volume of the work. Here they used it only — and not even consistently — in those places where capitals had been used in the preceding volumes, that is to say very rarely. Likewise in their second work, the *Selihot* of the German ritual (*Thesaurus A 3*), the Piove printers did not make much use of the new type size, the small text-type of the *Turim* being frequently used instead. In other words the printers could have produced both books, with no appreciable change in their general make-up, without ever using the new type font, and no apparent reason can be found for such changes as were made. It would almost seem as though their getting acquainted with the new small type of the two last Roman works the *SeMaG* and the *Moreh Nebukim* — after the first Piove volumes were already in press — had given impetus to the cutting of the new type size. This would imply that the entire period of Roman printing, of which

these were the last results, had ended before Meshullam Cusi brought forth his last volume in July, 1475.

Although I know that my reasons for fixing the date of appearance of the first Roman incunabula in the years 1469–1472 will be denied validity, I am certain that I have beyond all doubt demonstrated the priority of these books over the Turim published in 1475, and that in consequence the Rome incunabula must be accepted as the first printed Hebrew books. By going back from the more or less certain *terminus ad quem* given by the year 1475 to the time when the printing of the eight books in question must have been begun, any unprejudiced investigator would, in all probability, be led to the same initial date to which the foregoing considerations have led me.

Written 1938, revised 1947.

#### POSTSCRIPTUM:

Dr. I. Sonne, who read the manuscript of this article in fall 1946, referred me with respect to note 28 to his history of Hebrew printing ("Druckwesen") in the Encyclopaedia Judaica. On this occasion I found, to my great astonishment, that he had already in 1930 anticipated two of my theories: that the Rome incunabula may have been printed "vor 1480 und *vielleicht* sogar *vor 1475*" (the italics are mine) and that they could be "der Type nach . . . Vorläufer der Turim in Piove di Sacco."

The authors who inspired my work, Lazarus Goldschmidt and A. Marx, have been named above. With (unjustified) confidence in my memory I did not consider the possibility of the existence of other literature about my problems, and in consequence failed to re-read Dr. Sonne's article, whose priority I naturally acknowledge.

At the same time Dr. Sonne gave me the following note, in which he definitely refutes a recent attack on Simonsen's interpretation, cited on p. 487 above, of a quotation from Moses Provenzal in favor of the Roman origin of the edition of Solomon Ben Adret's Responsa. It gives me great pleasure to publish this note here. Dr. Sonne writes:

"Teicher's suggestion that *כתוב בחשובותיו הנרפסות ברומי* means: 'as is written in his printed Responsa on the top of no. 396' (*Journal of Jewish Bibliography* 1943, p. 54), can hardly be taken seriously. Provenzal was not even capable of such a feat of 'cleverness,' and he certainly would have used the simple expression *בראש סימן* for this purpose.

Furthermore, Teicher overlooked the following facts: a) At Provenzal's time there existed another collection of Adret's '*printed Responsa*,' generally known as vol. 1, ed. Bologna 1538 and Ven. 1545; b) These printed Responsa (especially no. 1209) are quoted by Provenzal simply as 'Adret's Responsa' (*חשובות* *הרשב"א*) without any qualification. It is clear that by *הנרפסות ברומי* Provenzal wanted to indicate that in this particular case he was not referring to the well-known collection of ed. Bologna and Venice, but to the less known one of the earlier edition. The connotation '*printed Responsa*' could not possibly be used as a mark of distinction since the other collection was also 'printed.' There must be added the place of the print (in Rome *ברומי*) in order to distinguish it from ed. Bologna."

Nevertheless, Dr. Sonne is not convinced of the existence of a Hebrew press at Rome in the fifteenth century; he does not believe "that Provenzal's reference has more than a subjective basis."



## CATALOGUE OF MANUSCRIPTS IN THE ROTH COLLECTION

By CECIL ROTH

For some time past, my friend Alexander Marx, greatest of Hebrew bibliographers of our day, has been urging me to publish a catalogue of my modest collection of manuscripts. In comparison with the remarkable Library that he has built up at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America — greatest quantitatively, and almost qualitatively, among the Hebrew collections of the world today — my few acquisitions must appear trivial. But a Septuagenarian's wish is law: and it is a pleasure as well as an honour for me to be able to comply with his behest in connexion with this happy celebration.

A few words on the genesis of my collection, in accordance with precedent, will not be out of place. The collector is born, not made: but there can be no doubt that my magpie tendencies were encouraged and enhanced by early intercourse with those two superb bibliophiles, Elkan Adler and Moses Gaster, whose names were a legend in the environment in which I grew up. (My friendship with David Sassoon came later.) At an early age I found romance in the word 'Manuscript', drama in the mere thought of the circumstances in which a codex had been written and studied, and music in the place-names associated with bygone Jewish rites and rituals, which always exercised a peculiar fascination on me. I can still recall the imbecilic joy with which I greeted my first authentic manuscript — a copy of the Carpentras *Mahzor*, acquired on my first visit there in 1922 — and my pride when Elkan Adler himself came round (with vainly gaping pockets) to inspect my finds. But it is never more true than in the case of the book-collector to say that 'l'appetit vient en mangeant'. Since then, I have had the good fortune to travel widely, and I regard it now as a cardinal prin-

ciple that, from the point of view of the book-collector, there is no such thing as an unlikely spot. The manner in which Hebrew MSS. travel is indeed amazing. I have acquired an Avignon MS. in Florence, a Corfu ritual in Cairo, a Cochin prayer-book in New York, an Indian *Ketubah* in Bloomsbury, a Spanish manuscript in Johannesburg, and a Greek one in, of all places, Greek-sounding Minneapolis (Min.). Moreover, contrary to what one might imagine, it is not a rich man's hobby: more important than unlimited resources are presence of mind and quickness of realisation, coupled of course with unquenchable optimism. On the other hand, a number of my best MSS. were acquired in exchange for printed books, especially in the course of the last few years. *Eheu fugaces, Postume!*

My collection is classified in accordance with a rudimentary system which allows the opportunity for reasonable expansion without disturbing the arrangement into subjects: —

- 1-100 Liturgy.
- 101-200 Poetry and Belles Lettres.
- 201-300 History and Historical Material.
- 301-400 Halakha, Midrash, and Rabbinical Literature.
- 401-500 Philosophy, Polemic and Cabbala.
- 501-600 Bible and Exegesis.
- 601-700 Karaite and Samaritan Literature.
- 701-800 Miscellaneous.
- 801-900 *Ketuboth*.

It is possible, without exceeding the space available to me to give here only a summary account of my manuscripts — more a handlist than a catalogue — notwithstanding the fact that greater prominence is inevitably allotted thereby to miscellaneous trivialities than to substantial MSS. of consistent value. It is to be hoped that nevertheless this will suffice to indicate approximately the scope of the collection, and may stimulate other workers in this field to make their treasures known to the world of scholarship in a similar fashion, even though they cannot have the good fortune to do so under such auspices.

HANDLIST OF HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS AND DOCUMENTS  
ILLUSTRATING JEWISH HISTORY AND LITERATURE  
IN THE COLLECTION OF CECIL ROTH, OXFORD

Liturgy

1. Services for Day of Atonement according to the Italian or Roman rite, 15th century: vellum.
2. Liturgy for whole year according to the Italian rite, with appendix of poems by Jehudah haLevi, Abraham ibn Ezra, Joab b. Benjamin and R. Maimon, 14th or 15th century: vellum.
3. Liturgy for whole year according to the Italian rite, completed by Daniel b. Samuel da Rossena in 1514, probably at Ferrara. The service for a Congregational fast-day, ff. 55b–60a, with several special hymns, is not in the printed liturgies. On ff. 3a–4b is a sermon delivered at a circumcision by Isaac Norsa; ff. 270b–273a, prayers and poems by the scribe for recital in time of pestilence. There are many extremely interesting notes on the fly-leaves, including a *curriculum studiorum*: vellum.
4. Services for Passover and Pentecost according to the rite of Avignon, copied in 1717 by Mordecai b. Solomon de Milhaud (a letter from whom to Abraham Guavay, in French, is drafted on fly-leaves).
5. Services for New Year according to the rite of Cavaillon, followed by Penitential prayers for eve of the Day of Atonement and תפלה תכון. On p. 122 the colophon, 'Fait par main de Jacob Amira Juif de Londres abitant de Cavallon, ce 30me May 1760'.
6. Compendium of prayers for special occasions, Comtadin (Lisle?) rite, written perhaps by Joseph de Milhaud, whose acrostic is accentuated on ff. 67, 72: on ff. 223–252 is a copy of the work בקור חולים (see MS. 316). A number of poems &c. in the collection are unknown, including (ff. 64–7) three hymns in Judaeo-Provençal, in addition to variants of two of the three hitherto printed.

7. Haggadah for Passover and 'Seder' for the night of Rejoicing of the Law, according to the Comtadin rite: at the end, a register of the De Meyrargues family, 1722-9.
8. Evening service for Pentecost, rite of Corfu: 18th century.
9. Liturgy for the whole year, Roman rite, 14th-15th century, with unpublished poems including *דר בשמי אולמו* of Daniel da Montalcino: vellum.
10. Services for Day of Atonement according to the rite of Lisle, splendidly written for his own use in 1729 by David b. Judah de Milhaud.
11. Prayers, hymns and table hymns for the Sabbath &c: Italian, 18th century.
12. Order of service for eve of New Moons of Heshvan and Iyyar in lieu of *תחנון*: Italian, 18th century.
13. Prayers to be recited in cemetery and on various occasions, in Judaeo-Italian, followed by prayers in time of pestilence, in Hebrew: at the end, a memorandum about the plague at Padua in 1631. Written by Marco della Badia, of Padua: 17th century.
14. Haggadah, rite of Yemen, 18th-19th century.
15. Service for circumcision, with nine poems, some unpublished, in old tinsel binding. Italian, 16th century: vellum.
16. *ספר הנותן אמרי שפר*; prayers for Sabbath &c., written on coloured papers in coloured inks, lavishly ornamented, and each page enclosed in floral border. Oriental, 19th century.
17. Services for New Year and Day of Atonement according to Franco-Italian (*אפ"ם*) rite, written at Fossano in 1673 by Immanuel b. Gad de Milhaud of Lisle-sur-Sorgue (!), with glosses, annotations and corrections in a later hand: f. 356b: record of some 30 Galician prisoners of war who made use of the volume in 1918.
18. *מנחה בלילה*: unpublished prayers and poems for the eve of New Moon according to the usage of Casale Monferrato, by Isaac Clava(=Katzigin), Isaac Cohen and Samuel Montalcino: at end, register of Clava family, 1745-1767.
19. Services for New Year, followed by Penitential prayers



for eve of Day of Atonement, according to rite of Carpentras. Copied in 1663 by Immanuel b. Gad de Milhaud for his kinsman, Nathan b. Judah de la Roque, and censored in 1687 by Antonio Francesco Enriques.

20. מוֹמֹרִים לַיַּל הַחוֹמָה: Service for night of Hosanna Rabba, followed by special hymns for the Three Festivals: Comtadin (?Lisle) rite, 17th century.
21. אֲשֵׁמֹרֶת: Penitential prayers, old Oriental (?Yemenite) hand.
22. Haggadah, rite of Yemen, ending with נִשְׁמָה: 17th century.
23. ס' קָצוֹר וּמִירֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל: Occasional poems and hymns according to the Sephardi usage, some unpublished, copied at Ferrara in 1792 by Bonaiuto Rocca: ff. 5-6, commemorative poem by R. (Jacob) Zahalon on the Ghetto fire in 1677, and f. 22, special memorial prayer for Aaron Berechiah Modena.
24. Circuits for the Rejoicing of the Law as instituted by Hayim Joseph David Azulai: Leghorn, c. 1800.
25. Formula for Benediction of the New Moon; large square hand, so as to be read in half-light. Leghorn, 18th century.
26. Concluding service for Day of Atonement, a variant of the Italian rite: *scribe*, Michael Jacob Finzi of Carpi. 18th century.
27. Service for Hosanna Rabba: Italian rite, with certain differences (e. g. form of exorcism of curses, and circuits with Scrolls of Law). Same hand as preceding MS.
28. Service for Day of Atonement, rite of Cavaillon, preceded by Penitential Prayers for previous day: 17th century.
29. Services for the New Year according to the rite of Lisle, written in 1650 by Nathan Joshua b. Solomon de Bedarrides in an exceptionally beautiful Comtadin rabbinic hand, with splendid decorative effect.
30. Hymns for Sabbaths, festivals, weddings &c., some otherwise unknown, by various North African poets, including Farji, Joseph b. Solomon Caspi, Masud, Mandali, Jacob Adhan, David b. Hasin, Joshua Zultan, Mansur, Saadiah Shuraki, &c.: 18th century.
31. Translation of the liturgy (Italian rite) into Italian, the

- hymns being rendered into verse. Followed by (i) Prayers to be recited in cemetery, by Israel Isserlein and Samuel Archevolti; (ii) *L'uomo Pentito*, Confessions ascribed to Bahya and to R. Nissim, with introduction; (iii) *L'occhio dell' ortografia*, regulations for the correct (!) writing of Italian; (iv) Translation of apocryphal Letter of the Sons of Moses, 1646. Author, translator and copyist, Salvador (i. e. Joshua) Segre of Scandiano, author of *אשם חלי*.
32. Translation of the liturgy into Judaeo-Provençal (i. e. Provençal in Hebrew characters). 14th century MS., with illuminated title-page with words *אחותי את היי לאלפי רבבה* (indicating that the volume was prepared as a wedding-gift to a sister) and numerous other decorations in gold and colour—probably the most important Judaeo-Provençal text extant. At the end, register of the Montel family, 1587–1614: vellum.
  33. Hymns, rite of Cochin: divided among 181 שירות (ff. 1–68), 21 בקשות (ff. 69–81) including two in Judaeo-Spanish (!); and 17 חשבחות (ff. 82–94), followed by services for Rejoicing of Law (ff. 95–110), Circumcision (ff. 111–121) and Marriage (ff. 122–146), with other poems on fly-leaves: 17th–18th century.
  34. Service for Rejoicing of Law, rite of Cochin, 17th–18th century, on rice paper.
  35. Poems and prayers for various occasions by Elijah, Moses, Israel &c.: 18th century Cochin hand.
  36. Marriage service and hymns, rite of Cochin, 18th century.
  37. MS. hymns and poems, rite of Cochin, including part of service for the Rejoicing of the Law, ff. 117 to 158 of a larger work: 18th century.
  38. משמרת הקדש: mystical midnight prayers as recited at Casale Monferrato, preceded by hymns of Moses Zacuto &c. and prayer for Solar solstice of 1713, in old morocco binding with armorial bearings: 17th century.
  39. Ritual of blowing the Shophar as practised at Safed, with circuits for Hosanna Rabba and Rejoicing of the Law,

- Franco-Italian (אפ"ם) rite, 17th century. *Owner*: Solomon Jedidiah Colon (=Colombo).
40. Hymns, rite of Cochin: modern copy.
  41. North African liturgical miscellany, with hymns &c. in Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic: *scribe* (of last portion only?) Abraham ibn Attar: 18th century.
  42. Daily and Sabbath prayers, Franco-Italian rite, written by Jonah Valobra and owned by Eliezer (1732) and Joseph Valobra of Fossano. On the fly-leaf, a sketch of Cap of Liberty &c., with date 1789: 17th–18th century.
  43. Prayers for women to recite before taking ritual bath, during pregnancy, on lighting Sabbath candles, &c. Italian, 18th century.
  44. Occasional Hymns (i) ff. 1–10, by R. Sabbetai Beer as recited in Cento, written for Judith w. of Samuel Hay Modena (ii) ff. 13–18: prayer for sustenance, recited on Eve of New Year (iii) ff. 19–32, prophetic lesson and hymns for the seventh day of Passover. Various Italian hands, 18th century.
  45. Liturgy, Yemenite rite, beginning with Sabbath prayers and concluding with those for Hosanna Rabba and Rejoicing of Law. Various hands of 17th–18th centuries.
  46. Collection of hymns and poems in the Hebrew character, mostly unpublished, in Hebrew and Judaeo-Greek (with some other languages interspersed), presumably from Corfu. The authors include Solomon b. Mazzal-tob, David b. Isaac, Isaac Samuel, Benjamin, Mordecai and Sabbetai (author of a maccaronic poem, f. 44b., in Hebrew-Greek-Italian-Aramaic, beg. שעה ניב דל אדון יה). 18th century. *Owner*: David Samuel.
  47. Poems, prayers and hymns according to the usage of Pitigliano (Tuscany), 18th century.
  48. Corpus of 124 poems and hymns for special occasions, many unpublished, some in Judaeo-Italian: 18th century.
  49. Miscellany of prayers for recital by women on various occasions, with a number of charms and remedies (directions in Italian): 18th century.
  50. Readings for סעודה שלישית, 18th century, written for 'Señor'

- Nissim Mercado Caro (Acquired, 1935, from a Karaite in Cairo).
51. Italian Jewish liturgical miscellany, including (i) hymns as recited at Cento, including one by Nathaniel Segre: written for Calonymus Carpi, 1795; (ii) Prayers and hymns for recital in cemetery; (iii) Prayer imploring that Hananiah b. Moses Daniel Bolaffi should repent and consent to divorce his wife (iv) Special prayers, poems and hymns copied by Jedidiah b. Laura, including an Italian rhymed version of צור משלו אכלנו (v) לאל עליון נתנה שיר: hymns recited in some Italian communities on Sabbath eve (printed in ברכות והודאות Florence 1760 and separately s. l. e. a., but not recorded by Davidson) (vi) ס' מפרש of Moses of Brest Litovsk (vii) Prayers to be recited in the cemetery (of Cento?) with special formulas for the graves of Nathaniel Segre, Emmanuel Hai Ricchi, Joseph Elisha Modena, &c. (viii) Expanded form of Confession (Oriental). Various 18th century hands.
  52. Hymns for various occasions, beginning זה השר למועד followed by המונים באו הלום (first verse only published) &c.; 18th century, perhaps from Casale.
  53. Circuits for Hosanna Rabba and Rejoicing of Law, followed by hymns for פורים בומבלי on the escape of the community during a bombardment and a hymn on Emancipation by R. Giuseppe Levi of Vercelli; 19th century.
  54. Fragment of Mystical prayers, hymns, psalms, 16th century: vellum.
  55. (i) Simhat Torah hymns, Urbino, some unrecorded, by 'Jacob', (ii) אל חי רכב מסילות by Bezalel b. Isaac (unpublished) and a hymn by Israel Najara (iii) Poem on Purim beg. ברוך מרדכי שקול כמשה (iv) Prayers to be recited in time of war (of Italian Liberation). Various hands of 18th–19th centuries.
  56. פתיחת אליהו and readings for various occasions, appended to printed copy of חפלת ישרים (Venice 1752).
  57. עמידה for New Year, with Cabbalistic כוונות, including permutations of the Tetragrammaton &c. Levantine or N. African, 18th century.



58. Liturgy for the whole year according to Roman rite, exquisitely written, in original velvet binding, with some unpublished hymns: 15th century: vellum.
59. פיומונים שנהגו לומר באשמורת הבקר על כסא די אליהו: poems and hymns recited on the night of a circumcision, with ornamental title-page and borders: 18th century.
60. ברית שלום: Poems and hymns recited on the occasion of circumcision, by Samuel Archevolti, Moses Leoni, Isaac Altaras, Judah Hayim Carpi, &c., some of them written to celebrate special occasions; followed by poem of 77 stanzas beg. שמע נא קהלי giving the laws for that rite, with an elaborate commentary. Written by Israel (cf. p. 1b) Mondolfo (cf. p. 33a) at Pesaro, about 1600. Illuminated title-page, and most pages in elaborate border, with decorated initials: vellum.
- 60a.-60b. Hymns &c. for circumcision: see below, MSS. 263, 264.
61. Omer scroll, on wooden roller, with coloured floral decorations: Italian, 18th century: vellum.
62. Haggadah for Passover Eve, with illuminations in colour and monochrome: written in 1753, and subsequently owned by Jospa b. Leizer Speier from Amsterdam: vellum.
63. Prayer-book for the whole year according to the Castilian rite, in splendid 15th century Sephardi hand. The MS. contains several unknown hymns and important variants in others. At the close are (i) תקון ברכות including the rite for the circumcision of slaves and proselytes (ii) Service at time of drought, including formula for נעילה service. (iii) Thanksgiving service, with poem beg. רובי חסדיך by 'Judah' (v) Laws for ציצית, calendar &c., (v) prognostications and miscellanies: vellum.
64. תקון חצות written for Calonymus Carpi, c. 1790.
65. Prayers, hymns and readings for commemoration of the dead, circumcision, the dedication of a house, &c., with some unpublished hymns, rite of Corfu: 18th century.
66. Mnemonic for Seder ceremony (קדש ורחץ וגו') with amplification in Judaeo-Apulian. Corfu, 18th century.

67. Hymns (many unpublished) for circumcision, marriage, for the Sabbath, and for various occasions; rite of Corfu. At the end regulations (in Italian) for the Jewish calendar. 18th century.
68. סדר של ליל ששי: list of readings for Friday nights throughout the year, at the end a hymn עליון קדוש (acrostic: ייבב לייב). Corfu usage, 19th century.
69. Service, hymns and readings for circumcision, marriage, &c., with horoscopes and miscellaneous material, rite of Corfu, 17th–18th century: at end, register of circumcisions, in Greek (!), 1875–1893. Owner: Sabbatai b. Elijah Yani, *shohet* of Zante, 1892, and of Avlona, 1894.
- 69a. Funeral service, &c., rite of Corfu: see below, MS. 731.
70. Collection of liturgical fragments.

### Poetry and Belles Lettres

101. אודרות of Solomon ibn Gabirol and Isaac Kimhi ('Mestre Petit de Nyons'): Provençal, 17th century.
102. Poems by R. Menahem Navarra, Rabbi of Verona (d. 1777), with some personal jottings: author's autograph.
103. Collection of poems by various hands: e. g., f. 1., by Abraham Hai Ortona on marriage of Joel and Rachel Conegliano at Ceneda in 1619: ff. 2–6, by Joseph Almanzi (holograph), addressed to Jacob Pardo. Italian, 16th–19th centuries.
104. Enigma (with design of Tree of Life) by Joseph Hayim b. Benjamin Cohen in honour of marriage of Dr. Elijah Consiglio and Esther b. Jacob Montalcino. Italian, 18th century.
105. Poem by Jacob Daniel Olmo in honour of marriage of Moses Hayim b. Nehemiah Hai Cohen and his cousin Nehama, Ferrara, c. 1750: 34 stanzas, with echo-device in Italian at end of each: coloured decorative border. Single sheet, 31" x 22".
106. Purim Dialogue, in Italian, on the qualities of women, as enacted before the 'Academicians' at Finale, near Modena (see p. 8a) c. 1700. The citations in Latin and Hebrew,

- references to classical lore &c., illustrate the intellectual level of a small Italian community in the age of the Ghetto.
107. 'Accademia esposta nel Talmud Torah di Ferrara la sera di Purim Piccolo l'anno 1735': Purim dialogue, with list of seven participants. (It was again produced in 1771).
  108. Poems for Purim in Italian (i) *Fate onor al bel Purim* (ii) *Diamo gloria al creatore* (iii) *Su Signor padre andiamo a cena*, 85 verses: c. 1800.
  109. Poems for Purim (i) *O compagni* — 80 stanzas (ii) *Ascoltate miei signori riveritti (!)*, 40 stanzas; (iii) *Reala (!) canzonetta sopra un spozalizio* (non-Jewish). Copied by David Alfa (חלפון) of Acqui, 1763.
  110. Maccaronic poem for Purim of 31 stanzas beg. *מה רבו מעשיך* (lines 1, 3, 6, 7 of each stanza in Hebrew, 2, 4, 5, 8 in Italian): followed by parody Haggadah for Purim night: 17th–18th century.
  111. Poem for Purim in 62 stanzas (*Del gran Dio onnipotente*): 18th century.
  112. Poems and hymns in various hands, including composition for dedication of Scroll of Law by Samson Cohen Modon; verses on marriage of Jacob Bonfil and Sarah Clava; Judaeo-Italian hymn for Hanukah; poems in Cochin hand by Nehemiah b. Ephraim &c.
  113. Folder of poems relating to Italian Jewish physicians: (i) two sonnets by Abraham Hai Ortona on graduation of Benjamin Forlì, c. 1600 (ii) poem in honour of marriage of Dr. Benjamin (=Guglielmo) Portaleone and Luna Antella (iii) poem in honour of graduation of Solomon Conegliano, 1660 (iv) printed broadside on marriage of Abraham Urbino to Judith, d. of Dr. Solomon Levi, c. 1750.
  114. Collection of Hebrew poems by Jacob Hai Gentile (חפץ), Aaron Hayim Pincherle, Menahem Navarra &c. in honour of the marriage of 'the divine philosopher, the expert physician' Dr. Gershom Basilea, c. 1750.
  115. Portfolio of occasional poems, mainly epithalamia, presented to bride and bridegroom on their marriage: some in folio or double folio, and to a large extent in the form of enigmas. In addition to these are a number (probably

- unique) in print, one of them on silk. Mainly from Italy, 17th–18th centuries.
116. Eight original poems by David b. Jacob Pardo, 1719–1792, some in enigma form (holograph).
  117. Collection of religious and occasional poems by various hands, from Italy, Corfu, &c., 17th–19th centuries.
  118. Corpus of 551 hymns and poems, mostly arranged in alphabetical order: North African (probably Moroccan), 18th century.
  119. יד יואב: A collection of poems, some of them for domestic occasions, composed in Ancona, Pesaro &c. in the 18th century by 'Joab' (Almagià?).
  120. Collection of about 100 poems and hymns, copied or composed by Joshua (Salvator) Fiametta, *hazan* in Ancona, including some by הר"ף (= R. Joseph Fiametta): a few prayers &c. are included: early 18th century.
  121. Jacob Fano's elegy on the Marrano martyrs of Ancona in 1556, and Solomon Hazan's on the Burning of the Talmud, 1553, with verse translation in Judaeo-Italian.
  122. Elegies on the Marrano martyrs of Ancona and on the burning of the Talmud, with Judaeo-Italian translations (some stanzas missing); again on the martyrs of 1556, beg. שמו שמים: on the martyrdom of Joseph Saralvo, 1583, beg. יגונותי ואנחותי and elegies for the Ninth of Ab by Zemah and Joseph [ben?] Nissim (Fermi?): copied in 1645.
  123. קינה על שרופי אנקונה: Elegy on the Martyrs of Ancona, beg. שבי אלמנה. *Owner*: Moses Vita Fano (Pesaro).
  124. ס' חבילי זמירות: poems by the 'accademici' on marriage at Cento in 1771 of Judah Hayim Sonnino and Esther b. Joseph Elisha Modena, with Italian introduction.
  125. Poems in Hebrew and Spanish recited in Bayonne on Thirty-Third day of Omer in honour of the Hebrew schools.
  126. Collection of about 335 Hebrew hymns and poems for various occasions, indexed, with supplements containing a further 50 (approximately), some in a different hand: authors include David b. Aaron ibn Hussein (frequently),



Mandil ibn Zimra, Isaac b. Jacob ibn Miraz, Masud b. Jeshua, Amram haShuhmi, Simon b. Labi, Shalom b. Zur, Solomon Amar, Samuel Arolio, Isaac b. Petahia, Jacob Adhan, Meir b. Jacob, Saadiah Shuraki, Abraham Alodi. North African hand, 18th century; 202 ff.

### History and Historical Material

201. 'Riflessioni in risposta di due scritture presentate dal Tribunal del S.to Ufficio di Portogallo al Seren.mo Principe D. Pietro . . . contro il ricorso delli Christiani de sangue Hebreo alla sede Apostolica. Offerte all Santità . . . di . . . Clemente X . . . 1674'. (For the 'due scritture' to which this is an answer, see D'Azevedo, *Historia dos Christãos Novos Portugueses*, p. 295). Original vellum binding, with armorial bearings.
202. 'Pinkas' (regulations, minutes and accounts) of the Jewish community of Penzance (Cornwall) from the construction of the new Synagogue in 1807 to 1829; Yiddish and English.
203. Minute-Book of Penzance Community, 1843–1864, with inventory of synagogal property.
204. Minute-Book of Penzance Community, 1864–1892.
205. Revised regulations of Penzance Community, 1844.
206. Portion of Diary, 18th century, Italian and Hebrew, including notes of sermons delivered by R. (Joseph?) Marini (Rabbi of Verona 1779–1802). Reference f. 3a to earthquake shocks in week of *ש"פ בשלח*, and p. 4a to seizure of child at Mantua for baptism.
207. Model Letter-book of Hezekiah(=Cesare!) Solomon Cuzzeri, mainly in Hebrew, but part in Italian: 17th century.
208. Circumcision register of 1745–1783: 168 by Menahem Navarra, Rabbi of Verona (d. 1777), with 10 later entries. The title-page has a curious artistic border (? by Navarra himself), depicting the circumcisional instruments.
209. Collection of 23 original deeds concerning the property of the Ravà family in the Ghetto of Verona, 1627–1666.

210. פרוטוקולו: עט סופר נקרא 76 letters and legal documents drawn up by a Veronese scribe (probably Abraham Hai Ortona), 1639–1643, a few in Italian: this and the previous manuscript constitute a mine of information concerning every aspect of Ghetto life.
211. Scroll for a private Purim instituted in 1758 (ש"פ וי"א) at Ferrara by Judah Hayim (Treves?) to celebrate the escape of his house from fire; vellum.
212. 'Commandamentos de diversos magistrados,' Venice 1589–1659: 18 documents (some with seals) from the Venetian authorities to the 'Ponentine' community, including one (1643) forbidding the recital of the memorial prayer for Moses Bendana with the formula אל נקמות ונר customary in the case of a martyr.
213. 'Copia delle orazioni e poesie che trovansi scritte attorno all' Oratorio Israelitico di Casale', verified in 1847 by G. Levi Gattinara. (Many of these historical inscriptions, some lengthy, have now disappeared, and are unpublished).
214. לשון חכמים: Copy-book of letters to and from N. African scholars (Shalom ibn Zur, Habib Toledano &c.), 17th–18th century.
215. אגרות: Copies of letters exchanged between Moroccan Rab-bis, in Fez, Mequinez, Safra, Sale, &c., 1802–1816: among the writers are Hayim Serrero, Joseph Botibol, Petahia, Mordecai Bidorgo, David Albaz &c.: there are also some novellae and sermons. Copyist: Abraham Turgeman.
216. Collection of 26 letters and documents in the dispute concerning the payment of communal taxation at Mantua by the Rovigo family, which removed in 1751 to Modena.
217. מגילת סאראגוסה, commemorating medieval deliverance of Jews in 'Saragozza' (Syracuse?): 17th–18th century, leather.
218. Circumcisional register, 1774–1800, by Isaiah Foà, in a north Italian community: some prayers and an original poem (acrostic 'Isaiah') at beginning: vellum.
219. Order of service, poems and prayers for consecration of עזרה for the Ashkenazi synagogue at Verona, 1764, together with regulations, documents and accounts relating to the same; exceptionally beautiful calligraphy.

220. יהוס האבות: illustrated account of the Holy Places in Palestine, written in Casale Monferrato, 1598 (reproduced in facsimile as 'The Casale Pilgrim', London 1929).
221. Historical documents, letters, addresses &c., Spalato and Ragusa, largely by members of the Pardo family: ff. 1-3. service of thanksgiving for escape of Spalato community during troubles in 1797, by Joseph Pardo.
222. Minute-Book, Verona, 1656-8, mainly dealing with adjudication in communal disputes, but including other details — e. g. prohibition to carry arms.
223. 'Pregoems': Formulary of Portuguese proclamations &c. according to usage of Amsterdam community, including numerous communal ordinances which had to be read annually in public.
224. Sermon by Diogo da Annuniação, Archbishop of Cranganor, at Lisbon Auto-da-Fè on September 6th 1705 (replied to by David Nieto), as prepared for the press.
225. Poems and prayers for two local Purims at Ivrea (i) for escape on the collapse of a house during a wedding celebration, 1785 (ii) 'Purim de' Briganti', 1801.
226. 'Escamot': A collection of sumptuary laws of the Jewish community of Leghorn, 1729-1756, in Portuguese, with minute regulations illustrating every side of social life.
227. Will of Letitia Nahmias (wife of the apostate Giulio Morosini, author of *Via della Fede*), with original documents, Venice 1668: Italian.
228. Charters and Regulations of the Jews of Leghorn, 1593-1783, in Italian, with marginal glosses and annotations calling attention to legal decisions and governmental rescripts.
229. Will of Israel Penso, Venice 1690 (Italian).
- 229a. 'Lascito de q. m. Israel Penso': Original documents 1700-1728 regarding the administration of the will.
230. Historical documents on Jews of Italy, including ff. 1-10; Memorial to the Grand Duke of Tuscany about the Monte di Pietà; ff. 15-6, letters to the author Girolamo Baruffaldi, with reference to Jewish baptisms; f. 18, prohibition of baptism of minors, Leghorn 1766; ff. 33-4, forms of action

- before the Jewish court at Mantua; f. 35, satirical poem on Napoleonic Sanhedrin, 1806. Other documents from Sienna, Verona, Mantua, Finale, Ferrara &c.
231. Hebrew documents on Jews of Italy, including memorial lists of Rabbis &c. of Ancona from 16th century; account of forced baptism in Rome, 1783; poem on visit of Antonio Piubini, Governor of Verona, to the Synagogue; *Shehita* license from Elijah Hai Gallico for Raphael Hayim Foà, Bozzolo 1804; same from Saul Crémieux and Moses Apta for Moses Ravel, Avignon 1770 (vellum); Rabbinical diploma for Phineas Hai Anau (=Felice Umato) from Isaac Lampronti, Ferrara, n. d. (vellum); Register of Almanzi family, 1773–1804: occasional prayers, hymns, &c.; 16th–19th centuries.
232. Annual Order of Service at Cento on escape from conflagration on 12th Ab 1820: followed by prayer at time of cholera, &c., and hymn written by Isaac Berechiah da Fano at Senigallia in 1723, introduced to Cento 1810.
- 232a. Annual order of service at Cento on escape from conflagrations in 1774 and 1792; followed by prayers in time of war and during excessive rains.
233. מולת מצרים: account of deliverance of Jews of Cairo, 1524, with Judaeo-Arabic translation, 17th century.
234. Legal documents and deeds, Hebrew and Italian, mainly 17th–18th centuries, e. g. regulations for communal tax, Urbino 1741; articles of betrothal (with original poem) Pesaro 1770; deeds for sale of house at Senigallia, 1679, &c.
235. Service for a local Purim, including an unpublished poem beg. עמי נשיר כלנו; parody Memorial prayer and funeral circuits referring to the providential death of an anti-Semitic official named Capponi (MS. Urbino).
236. 'Libro de Recebidas do . . . Talmud Torà de' Ponentini': Receipt-book of Portuguese community of Venice. 1649–1665: Spanish, Portuguese and Italian.
237. 'Instrumenti': register (Italian) of annuities sold by Venetian community to non-Jews in order to secure funds for communal purposes, 1690–1718.



238. 'Sequestros e Liberasois' (sic): original documents (Italian) authorising sequestrations and releases to be carried out by the Venetian community, 17th century.
239. Illuminated Patent of appointment of Pedro de Soto Lopez, Notary, as Familiar of the Inquisition, Mexico City, 1648: vellum.
240. License to Passapaire family to leave the Rome ghetto without wearing the Jewish badge, 10th January 1720 (with two renewals).
241. Certified extract of deliberation of Council of the City of Verona relating to the Jews, 1694, with magnificent example of communal seal.
242. Letter of Joshua van Oven to P. Colqhoun regarding the amelioration of the condition of the Jews in London, March 24th 1801.
243. Plan (of Joshua van Oven) for ameliorating the condition of the Jews in London: fair copy, with notes and corrections in author's hand.
244. Illuminated Patent of protection by Cardinal P. A. d'Aragona for David Sanson and Aaron Pavia, of Mantua, 1787: single sheet, vellum.
245. Similar by Cardinal Francesco Maria de' Medici for Sabato di Samuel Levi, of Leghorn, 1703: single sheet, vellum.
246. Privileges from Grand Duke of Tuscany for Isaac, Moses and Jacob Calò, of Florence, 1712/3: single sheet, vellum.
247. Proclamation of Central Consistory of the Jews of the French Empire to their Italian coreligionists, in Italian, regarding the Napoleonic reorganisation etc. 22nd March 1812.
248. Poem (40 stanzas) by Menahem Azariah celebrating escape of the community of Pitigliano (Tuscany) when the roof of the communal school collapsed, 1757.
249. Begging letter from an apostate, Jacob ben Rabbi Samuel, to the Earl of Huntingdon, 1666, referring to 'that unhappy fire in London hath undone me, for my plearce (*sic*) and for my hebrew bookis'; Hebrew and English.
250. Miscellaneous documents &c. relating to Anglo-Jewish history, including will of Israel Jacob of Canterbury (prob-

- ably not a Jew), 1692: Halitzah document, Chichester 1832: documents relating to Phineas Nieto, father of Haham David Nieto, Venice 1659: letters of Chief Rabbis S. Hirschell, N. M. Adler, H. Adler, and J. H. Hertz; draft will of Mrs. N. M. Adler; letters of Joseph Wolff and A. McCaul (missionaries), and of L. Loewe (on behalf of the Duke of Sussex) &c.; petition (in Persian) on behalf of the Persian Jews, 1866, signed by Moses Montefiore (twice!) in Hebrew and English: letter of thanks to Lady Montefiore from the wives of the liberated Jews of Damascus, 1840; documents regarding the pioneer Anglo-Jewish newspaper, *The Voice of Jacob*, 1841: draft loyal addresses of Board of Deputies on birth of the future Edward VII., 1841: &c.
251. Documents concerning the English pseudo-Messiah, Richard Brothers, 'Nephew of the Almighty', including letter of T. P. Foley, London 1801, declaring his allegiance, endorsed by the recipient (with autograph).
  252. Letters and documents, including letters of Giuseppe Marini, Rabbi of Verona, 1789, 1791: autograph receipts of Moses Zacuto, 1622: ספור הנס, account of a trivial escape and commemorative prayers: Shehita license for Solomon Hay Saadun, Pitigliano 1841: declaration by Ishmael Cohen, permitting rice on Passover, on authority of איש גר, Modena 1801: Letter of Abraham Reggio (father of I. S. Reggio) to his bride, Gorizia 1783.
  - 252a. Letters and documents, Ashkenazic, including commendatory letter (Metz 1781), with many endorsements; epitaphs, sermons &c.
  253. חולדות ישר: German hand of 18th century.
  254. Deeds, documents and letters relating to the Jews of Palestine, including appeal from the Rabbinate of Verona for prayer at the Western Wall c. 1777; letter of commendation from Tiberias for Asher Ashkenazi, addressed to community of Sienna, 1791: legal document, Jerusalem 1711: documents relating to Maghreb community of Jerusalem, 1861-1872: Regulations of Aboab *Yeshiva* in Safed, 17th century; two letters of recommendation from Tiberias to

- community of Gibraltar, 1749; letter of commendation for Abraham the Proselyte of Safed, 1821 (printed) and other printed appeals; series of letters from Samuel Salant and the Jerusalem Rabbinate to Louis Loewe; &c.
255. Order of service by Jacob Israel Carmi for local Purim at Correggio on escape from earthquake in 1832.
- 255a. Idem, 18th century, on escape from earthquake (no indication of place or date).
- 255b. Idem, 1803.
256. Idem for Seruide, 25th Tammuz 1809, on escape from bandits.
257. Idem for Sienna, on escape from earthquake, 11th Sivan 1798; special hymn and prayer inserted.
258. Anonymous hymn, beg. *קומו תנו תודה אל אל עמו פדה* for local Purim on escape of synagogue from fire, signed *הצעיר*: Italian, 18th century.
259. Receipt-book (Italian) for annuities granted by Venetian community, 1715–1731.
260. *תולדות האר"י*: account of birth and marvels of R. Isaac Luria, with some magical and superstitious recipes. *Scribe*: Menahem Sabbetai Jacchia (Yahia), Lugo, 17th century.
261. Personal account book of Chief Rabbi N. M. Adler from 1863.
262. Letter and common-place book of Hayim (Vita) Volterra, of Ancona, c. 1714, including an account of trouble with the Inquisition and flight to London, a lengthy correspondence with Jacob Daniel Olmo of Ferrara, &c., and various cabbalistic, Biblical glosses, &c.
263. Transcripts and memoranda in Italian relating to the history of the Jews in Ancona, mainly at the time of the Napoleonic wars.
264. List of 106 circumcisions at Ancona &c., by Samuel Mordecai Cagli, 1674–1720, appended to a MS. order of service and hymns for the ceremony.
265. List of 17 circumcisions at Ancona, 1710–6, and 10, 1914–5, appended to MS. copy of hymns &c. for the ceremony: decorated borders.
- 265a. List of circumcisions, in Greek: see number 69.

266. Letters of Jewish scholars: S. Poznanski, M. Kalisch, E. N. Adler, A. Büchler, M. Gaster, I. Abrahams, Lucien Wolf, I. Davidson, S. Krauss, &c.
267. Minutes and Transactions of the London Beth-Din, under the Presidency of R. Solomon Hirschell, 1805–1835, comprising much information concerning the religious and social life of English Jewry at this period. (Conversions to Judaism, assimilation, family life, family history, the earliest Rabbinical mission to Australia, &c.)
268. Laws of the Great Synagogue, London, 1827, in Hebrew and English, with MS. supplement (38 pp.) comprising amendments and additions, 1836–1853.
269. 'Memorbuch' of the Jewish community of Darnheim (Swabia) with lists of benefactors and martyrs (including 'the martyrs of England') recited in the Synagogue: copied in 1753, with additions to 1771; vellum.

#### Halacha, Midrash and Rabbinic Literature

301. Fragment of ספר מצות גדול, with many variants and glosses, Franco-German hand of 13th century; and of יד החזקה, Italian hand of 14th century: vellum.
302. ביאור הכתובה: Commentary on Marriage Contract (as issued at Sassuolo, 13th Adar 1615) by Abraham del Vecchio.
303. Letters and Responsa from various hands, including Raphael Campos (1784), Jacob Pardo (1784) Nehorai Germison of Tripoli (1774), David Piazza of Spalato (1812), &c.
304. לחם הפנים: partial commentary on יורה דעה by Isaac Levi Valle of Verona (d. 1680).
305. Letters and Responsa from various hands, including holograph letter in Italian by Isaac Lampronti to Manovel (sic) Redi, 1698, responsa by Benjamin Cohen Vitale, Isaiah Bassani, Malachi Cohen, &c.
306. מנהגי קק"י אורבינו: Customary of community of Urbino, with hymns for various occasions at end.



307. שאלות ותשובות . . . בדיני שחיטות ובדיקות: laws of Shehita in question and answer, written for Joshua Gabriel Pujaud (? Puget), with family register: Provençal.
308. שחיטות וש"ת עם בדיקות וש"ת: laws and regulations of Shehita, ff. 1-45 in Hebrew and 46-88 in Italian: written by Judah b. Benjamin for Marco (Mordecai) Levi; seventeenth century: vellum.
309. סדר הרפות according to usage of Fez: compiled by Joseph b. Aaron Zarfati and copied by Solomon b. Maimon Botibol. The authorities mentioned include Hayim ben Ha-Mozeg, Jacob Hagiz, Saadiah ibn Danon, Abraham Zarfati, &c. N. African, 17th century.
310. Treatise on Shehita: Italian, 17th century.
311. on the calendar, copied from Venice ed. of 1595, with עברונות ס' copied from Riva ed. of 1591, with astronomical and other notes, the earliest 1737: late Provençal hand.
312. סדר הליצה compiled and written by Ishmael Cohen (Laudadio Sacerdote) of Modena, c. 1790.
313. Novellae on Talmudical tractates of Yebamoth, Ketuboth, Gittin &c., by Habib Toledano, with notes on Elijah Mizrahi's Biblical commentary &c., N. African, 17th century.
314. תולדות שמשון (commentary on Ethics of Fathers) by Samson Hayim Nahmani, 18th century.
315. שני לוחות הברית compiled from כללי התלמוד. N. African, 18th century.
316. בקור חולים (regulations for visiting the sick and dying) by Hezekiah Mordecai Bassani (? holograph.)
317. אגרת הקדש (iii) יורה דעה (ii) חטאים (i) Midrashic miscellany פרק רבנו הקדוש. Yemenite MS., dated 1589.
318. מדרש חמשה חומשי תורה: Commentary on difficult words of Hebrew and Arabic; Yemenite MS. dated 1589, with prayers for Day of Atonement and Midrashic notes (in later hand) appended.
319. הלכות שחיטה וטרפות העוף: Laws of Shehita followed by regulations for כפרות. Written for Hayim b. Judah Ashkenazi, Corfu 1769.

320. **הלכות שחיטה** &c. by Isaac of Düren (ff. 1–13a, **הלכות שחיטה**: ff. 13a–35b, **הלכות טרפות בקצור**: f. 36, **הלכות טרפות**: ff. 37a–53a, **הלכות ברכות** by Meir of Rothenburg: ff. 54b–63b, **הלכות נדה**: ff. 63b–127b, **אסור והחיר** by Isaac of Düren. More than printed text, and with important marginal glosses: *Scribe*: Aryeh Halfon Zarfati. According to a note in the handwriting of Hayim b. Israel Nathan Soncino, the MS. was redeemed by him from pawn. Franco-German Rabbinic hand of 14th–15th century, with pen-and-ink ornamentations, in contemporary binding (probably Venetian); four censor's signatures; vellum.
320. **עמודי הגולה** (or **ספר מצות קטן**) by Isaac of Corbeil; many readings not in printed text. Most beautifully written in multicoloured inks, with initial words &c. in colour and additional glosses in decorative borders: the seven section-headings illuminated in gold and colours. An exceptionally lovely specimen of calligraphy, written for Joseph haKatan of Loch . . . (?) by the scribe Abraham b. Hezekiah, finished Wednesday (7th) Iyyar 1395: vellum.
322. **דיני אסור**: Ritual laws on dietary code by R. Sussman of Krems (Upper Austria), reputed teacher of Abraham Klausner, with glosses: followed by **הלכות נדה** and regulations for ritual bath, redemption of first-born &c. German, about 1400.
323. **הלכות סנהדרין** from **יד החזקה**, Maimonides' Code, chapter xii., **הלכות עדות** and **הלכות ממרים** to chapter iv. Some important variants, and a tendency to a purer Hebrew than in the printed texts. N. African or Oriental hand of the 14th century, with ornamentations in colour.
- 323a. **שמע נא קהלי**: laws for circumcision, in verse, with commentary. See No. 60.

### Philosophy, Polemics and Cabbala

401. The lost work **דרך חיים** by Joseph ibn Jahia, copied by the chronicler Gedaliah ibn Jahia at Codignola in 1560, after the author's MS. had been destroyed during the burning of Hebrew literature.

- 402-3. Anonymous translation into Italian of the ספר עקרים by Joseph Albo, about 1600: 2 volumes.
404. ספר כוונות: Cabbalistic Miscellany (i) ff. 1-65, the first and second מהדורות being given in parallel columns (ii) ff. 66-74, miscellaneous Cabbalistic notes and prescriptions: (iii) ff. 75-163, עץ חיים of Hayim Vital Calabrese (iv) ff. 165-176, סדר תפלות על פי הסוד. Italian, 17th century.
405. ספר נקרא כלול: treatise on ethics divided into thirty sections for daily reading throughout the month. Compiled by 'Joseph' (see acrostic poem at beginning) and copied c. 1550 by Joseph b. Isaac Levi as a present for his uncle (Dr.) David ben Moses Portaleone of Mantua from an old MS. in his father's library. Bound up with צמח צדיק (Venice, 1600).
406. Zohar with Moses Cordovero's commentary, Genesis vi to xxv: Oriental, 18th century.
407. חסד לאברהם by Abraham Azulai, with considerable differences from printed version. Italian, 17th century.
408. Letters of Aaron d'Antan to M. della Croza (de la Creuze), Royal Librarian at Berlin, justifying his conversion to Judaism. Italian, translated from French, with interesting Hebrew preface: 18th century.
409. שער הנקודים of ס' הכוונות by Hayim Vital, to chapter 3 of שער הנקודים, copied by Todros Nizza: 17th century.
410. ס' כנפי יונה by Menahem Azariah da Fano, in two Italian hands of 17th-18th centuries.
411. Cabbalistic miscellany, including the hymn מלכא רבא followed by discursus and confessions; שמוש חמשה חומשי תורה; and כוונות for blowing of Shophar, written by Moses Finzi.
412. Mystical prayers, כוונות and diagrams on blowing the Shophar, followed by השליך service: vellum.
413. שערי אורה of Joseph Giquatilla. Yemenite MS. of 16th century, bound with מדרש חז"ה (see no. 516a).
414. דרוש השתלשלות העולמות by Isaac Luria, copied by Judah b. Joseph Levi א"ק (? = Adelkind or אדלשטין), 1661.
415. 'Risposte al libro che fu dato alla stampa da Pad. e Pinamonte intitolata La Sinagoga Disinganata,' by Judah (Leon) Bariel, of Mantua: finished June 1702.

- 416. Miscellaneous notes, largely Cabbalistic, mainly in hand-writing of Benjamin Cohen Vitale, embodying parts of a Commentary on the Zohar: 18th century.
- 417. קמיעה with Cabbalistic designs: vellum.
- 418. Cabbalistic tree, shewing four of seven ספירות, with various designs. Italian, 18th century: vellum.
- 419. פירוש רמב"ם of Moses Cordovero: שער הטעמים in full, with large parts of previous and subsequent sections (f. 219 sqq. of full work). Spanish hand, 16th century.
- 420. פירוש התפלות ע"פ הסוד by Hayim Vital: N. African, 17th century, with some later additions.
- 421. Mystical interpretation of דצ"ך עד"ש באה"ב: Italian, 18th century.
- 421a. Menahem Recanati's mystical commentary on Pentateuch; see no. 526.
- 422. Amulets, some on vellum, with mystical designs.

#### Bible and Commentaries

- 501. Pentateuch, Deuteronomy xi.25-xxxi.16, with Targum: both with superlinear punctuation (sublinear also for the Hebrew text). Early Yemenite MS., perhaps 13th century; parchment.
- 502-3. Pentateuch, with Rashi's commentary, Judaeo-Arabic grammatical preface, Massorah Magna and prophetic portions, some decorations in colour: a deed of sale of 1944 S. E. (= 1631-2) is appended. Yemenite MS. of 15th-16th century: 2 volumes, double column.
- 504. Book of Proverbs, xiv.30 to xix.2, with Arabic version in Hebrew characters (not that of Saadiah) and commentary perhaps of Japhet ibn Ali (cf. Günzig's ed. of caps. i-iii, Cracow 1898, and Auerbach's of cap. xxx., Bonn 1866). Early (13th century?) Karaite hand.
- 505. Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes, with Targum and Rashi's commentary: Yemenite, 17th century.
- 506. Obadiah Sforza's commentary on the Pentateuch, Genesis xlv-Exodus xxiv: ff. 39-40 of full work. Italian, 16th century.



507. Prophetical Lesson (Isaiah, I &c.) for the Sabbath preceding the Ninth of Ab, with Spanish paraphrase for liturgical use: written by A. D. de la Penha (Amsterdam, 18th century?).
509. Scroll of Esther, very richly illustrated in sepia. French, late 16th century: vellum.
508. Scroll of Esther; minute caligraphic example, with characters barely one millimeter high. Italian, 18th century; vellum.
510. Scroll of Esther, in ivory case: Italian, 18th century; vellum.
511. Scroll of Esther, oriental, 16th century, with traces of palimpsest: leather.
512. Scroll of Esther, exquisitely illustrated with cut-out designs. Italian, 17th century; vellum.
513. Scroll of Esther, illuminated in colour. German, early 17th century; vellum.
514. Scroll of Esther, within engraved copper-plate border by Salom Italia, c. 1640: vellum.
515. Scroll of Esther, within copper-plate border, German, late 17th century; vellum.
516. Commentary on Psalms cxix-cxliii (imperfect): Italian, 17th century.
- 516a. מדרש חמשה חומשי תורה: commentary on Pentateuch by Jacob Asheri. Yemenite, 16th century. (Bound with MS. 413).
517. Strips of Pentateuchal scroll, cut into shape by a cobbler as soles for shoes. Recovered in Greece (Salonica and Athens), July 1946.
518. ספר של חרושים: novellae on Pentateuch (to middle of Exodus), 1753: probably by Jacob Pardo.
519. חלוקי פסוקי התורה by Aaron b. Asher, on misleadingly similar verses of Pentateuch: modern Ashkenazi hand.
520. Commentary on Prophets by R. David Kimhi, Spanish hand of 15th century (damaged by damp): paper and vellum.

521. Prophetical Lessons (הפטרות) for whole year, Ashkenazi rite, with some minor differences: coloured escutcheon at end. German or N. Italian, dated 1478; vellum.
522. Scroll of Esther, exceptionally large, on ivory roller.
523. Scroll of Esther, leather.
524. Scroll of Esther, with initial illumination and illuminated sheet of benedictions; 18th century; vellum.
525. Scroll of Esther, 18th century, on wooden roller; vellum.
526. פרוש על החזרה: Menahem Recanati's mystical commentary on the Pentateuch; superb Spanish 15th century Rabbini-cal hand: vellum.
527. Pentateuchal scroll, probably German, 18th century, vellum. From the collection of E. N. Adler.
528. Scroll of Esther, Sephardi hand, with coloured illuminations in Chinese (!) style: vellum.
529. Genesis xlii.30-xliii.24, with Judaeo-Arabic translation: Oriental (? Karaite), 13th century.
530. Amos ix.I-12, with Judaeo-Arabic translation and commentary (water-stained): Oriental (Karaite?), 15th century.

### Karaite and Samaritan Literature

601. Portion of ritual for Day of Atonement according to the Karaite rite: oriental (as is the case with the following MSS.), 15th or 16th century.
602. Grace after meals, for Sabbath and Passover, Karaite, written for Elijah son of the physician Jeshua, son of the late physician Mordecai: 17th century.
603. Funeral hymns, Karaite rite; authors: Shemaiah, Elijah, Samuel 'mourning for his loved one', Solomon the Karaite, Abraham.
604. Service for 'Rejoicing of Law' (שבת בראשית) in two different 17th-18th century hands: the first part written in colours, the second by Samuel b. Joseph.
605. Table of scriptural readings, in Judaeo-Arabic, shewing division into, and of, weekly portions, with prophetical lessons and festival readings: 17th century.

606. Treatise on Hebrew grammar in Judaeo-Arabic, followed by treatise on cantillation and rules for interpretation of scripture.
607. Pentateuchal homilies (מקראות) on various weekly portions, written by Jacob b. Mordecai haNasi, and others, interspersed with poems and petitions: various 17th–18th century hands (cf. Adler, *Catalogue*, p. 15 and *About Hebrew Manuscripts*, p. 21).
608. Poems and hymns, apparently for the Atonement service, including compositions by Abraham Samuel, Solomon Cohen, Hasdai, Moses b. Samuel, Solomon Cohen: c. 1600.
609. Karaite letters and documents, including a complimentary letter from the community of Cairo to that of Jerusalem, headed by Moses Levi (fl. c. 1400): his brothers Abraham and Saadiah are also mentioned. Six documents, 14th–19th centuries.
610. Karaite liturgical fragments for festival services &c. 16th century onwards: 4to.
611. Portion of Karaite daily prayers, 17th–18th century.
612. Portions of Karaite liturgy for New Year &c., 17th century.
613. Karaite liturgical fragments (some substantial), 17th–18th centuries.
614. Karaite Passover Eve service (הגדה) written in black and red, 16th–17th centuries.
615. Portions of Karaite Sabbath services, with hymns by 'Israel', Mansur, Meshullam &c.: 17th century.
616. Portions of Karaite liturgy for festivals, 16th–18th centuries
617. Portions of Karaite liturgy for various occasions (funeral service &c.), 17th–18th centuries.
618. Portions of Karaite liturgy for Day of Atonement &c., 17th–18th centuries: 8vo.
- 618a. Karaite marriage contracts; see MSS. 847–8.
- 618b. Commentary of Japhet b. Ali on Proverbs: see MS. 504.
619. Samaritan Pentecost liturgy: modern.
620. Samaritan wedding service and regulations.
621. Samaritan Passover liturgy, bought at Nablous on May 15th, 1935.
622. Daily Prayers, Samaritan, 19th century.

- 623. The vessels of the Sanctuary, in colours, with descriptions; contemporary Samaritan drawing.
- 623a. Samaritan Marriage Contract; see MS. 849.
- 624. Occasional prayers for marriage, birth, circumcision &c., Samaritan.
- 625. Service for New Year and 'the first seven months', Samaritan.
- 626. Service for the seven days of the week, including the Sabbath, Samaritan.
- 627. 'Prayer of the fourth day, whereon Moses spoke with God and received the Law', Samaritan.
- 628. Historical record and genealogy of the Samaritan High Priests.

### Miscellaneous

- 701. Miscellaneous writings of Solomon Candia (d. 1630) including letters, poems, aphorisms, love letters in Judaeo-Italian, and long Sabbath-poem, *Ben venuta o bella sposa* in Judaeo-Italian.
- 702. Scroll of Ezekiel, embodying the account of the Theophany &c. and petitions in name of Moses Reuben Ezekiel Judah, deposited in Tomb of Ezekiel near Baghdad. Oriental, 18th century: leather.
- 703. תפלת בית כנס של רואמי :יום אחד. translation of Roman Catholic afternoon and evening offices for Sunday into puerile and inaccurate Hebrew: 17th century (1664?).
- 704. Miscellaneous writings of Israel Hezekiah Bassani, Rabbi in Padua, 1632-1678, including sermon notes in Judaeo-Italian &c.; f. 16b, collection for Hebron; f. 17, regulations for חכרת שבבים; f. 163a, letter to Hebron; ff. 95-7, regulations for communal cheese-maker.
- 705. Miscellaneous writings of Samuel Cabib of Sienna (1809-1879), including laws of Shehita, Italian-Hebrew vocabulary, poems, letters &c.
- 706. Miscellaneous notes, sermon-notes, expositions, mystical formulae &c., a little in Italian (some in Hebrew characters): f. 214, curriculum of study: f. 214b, deed dated 1678; f.



- 148, קביעות עולמי — the author's daily programme of spiritual and intellectual exercises.
707. Miscellaneous notes and expositions: f. I., sermon in memory of Joel Pincherle (17th century).
708. 'De Febre maligna punticulari' by Pedro *alias* Ezekiel de Castro (see my identification in REJ xciv. 96–97 and xcv. 82–5).
709. Writings of Samuel Levi Mortara, Rabbi of Verona, 18th century: drafts of poems, and letters, but principally Cabalistic notes, novellae &c.; the MS. throws much light on local conditions.
710. Offertory-book of a London synagogue; vellum.
711. Hebrew miscellany, embodying prayers for women, on nuptial night &c.: astronomical notes; commentary on חר נדיא by Moses Nahman; anonymous sermon delivered at Casale in 1658; and 58 popular remedies and charms. Various Italian hands of 17th–18th centuries.
712. Sermons of Menahem Navarra at Verona, 1765 (i), in Sephardi confraternity (ii) in commemoration of the segregation of the Jews in the Ghetto, 1601.
713. Sermon of same, 1775, on payments for Casella (communal taxation).
714. Idem, 1769.
715. Sermons of same, 1758, including one on behalf of Palestine.
716. Sermons, Hebrew and Italian, 17th–18th centuries.
718. Sermons in Judaeo-Italian, 16th–18th centuries, by Gershon Cohen Cologna (friend of L. da Modena), Hezekiah Bassani, &c.
717. לוח מאמרי עין ישראל: alphabetical index, with glosses, by Jehiel b. Samuel Sanguini (of Modena?): copied in 1621/2 by Judah Aryeh Poggetto as present for the author's brother, Simha.
719. Sermons by Jacob b. David Pardo (Rabbi at Ragusa and Spalato) for the Sabbaths before Passover, including 22 (!) for שבת הגדול. Author's holograph.
720. כללים by Jacob Pardo: mystical rules of conduct.
721. Rhyming dictionary (bv same hand as 720?).

722. Sermons by Giuseppe Marini, Rabbi of Verona, 1788, 1793, 1796.
723. Small fragments from Genizah.
724. File of miscellaneous documents, poems, single-sheets &c.
725. Miscellaneous documents, letters and notes in Judaeo-Spanish, from 18th century, including letters from Solomon Musaphia [to Jacob Pardo], Samuel Toledano, David Pinto, &c. and a hymn beg. 'El dios alto con su gracia' [from Rhodes].
726. Shehita license for Isaac Moscato, Corfu 1783, with decorative border: vellum.
727. Hebrew and Italian miscellany, including sermons, novellae, Cabbalistica, &c.; 17th–18th centuries.
728. Miscellany of popular medicine and charms (i) 100 magical prescriptions — e. g. for invisibility, cure for epilepsy, stone, &c.; (ii) charms for various purposes — e. g. 'to impoverish thine enemies', with mystical alphabet (iii) 'a deep secret for connubial intercourse' &c. (iv) a secret to prevent a person from apostatising. Various hands.
729. Halachic and ethical miscellany, including דין חבט הקבר and ס' הדרכה by R. Abraham: copied for wedding of Dr. Jacob Gershom Basilea; 18th century.
730. עולת יצחק ושדה אריה: sermons delivered 1794–1806 (? by Isaac Lyon) in New Synagogue &c. in London before חבורת האמת והשלום ומעריב בומנו &c. including, ff. 10–13, one at time of danger for Jews of Frankfort in, summer of 1794.
731. Miscellany written or collected by Jacob Yani, of Zante, including laws of Shehita &c. in Greek; idem in Hebrew; calendrical notes; Hebrew grammatical exercises; prayers, hymns &c., with services for circumcision and for burial, according to the rite of Corfu and Zante; f. 22, a poem in Hebrew-Greek-Italian, beg. ואשר בכך ישישו and f. 23b, one in Judaeo-Greek, beg. אינש אקיריש אוחיאוש.
732. Story of Joseph, Prayers &c., in Judaeo-Arabic: 17th century.
733. Sermons on Genesis, Hebrew and Italian: 18th century.

### Marriage Contracts &c.

The כתובות or Marriage Contracts in the collection are all somewhat noteworthy specimens. Those from Italy — all on vellum — are generally illuminated, sometimes very richly and with considerable artistic skill. Most of the others are decorated, but are far less noteworthy from this point of view. On the other hand, the attempt has been made to build up a representative collection, rather than a large one, with characteristic specimens from many countries. Such documents are of some significance for the study of social, cultural, economic and family history, and they deserve a detailed description; but there is room here for only a summary account. The place, date, and (in most cases) family names only are indicated.

801. Venice, 1645, Cividali-Cividali, with תנאים or supplementary conditions, witnessed by Leone da Modena and Simha Luzzatto: exceptionally beautiful illumination.
802. Ferrara 1669, Leoncini-Zalman: unusual illumination.
803. Mantua, 1704, Norsa-Gentile.
804. Verona, 1719, Zion-Gallico.
805. Monte S. Savino (Tuscany), 1793: Salamone Fiorentino (the poet) — Regina Navarra.
806. Rome, 1813, Tivoli-Sacchi; the illumination embodies the Book of Esther in minuscular hand.
807. Pesaro, 1735, Levi-Levi: elaborate illumination (49 miniatures!)
808. Ferrara, 1738, Rossi-Anau.
809. Leghorn, 1757, Sierra-Liuzzi (with תנאים).
810. Rome, 1808, De Castro-Uziel(li).
811. Rome, 1836, Della Riccia-Cavi.
812. Ancona, 1784, Senigallia-Pacifico, (with תנאים); fine illuminations.
813. Pesaro, 1790, Montebrocchi-Mondolfo.
814. Modena, 1799: Rabbi Ishmael Cohen (Laudadio Sacerdote) — Regina Padovani.
815. (Finely illuminated border: text missing).
816. Padua, 1817: Baron Isaac Treves-Consolo.

817. Rome, 1820, Constantini-Chimici (Kimhi).
818. London, 1793, Isaac Cohen-Hannah b. Ezekiel.
819. Portsea (England), 1830, Samuel Levi-Brendele b. David: in copper-plate border used by London Sephardi community.
820. London 1835, Samuel Magnus-Reisele Cohen; illuminated border with badge of Hambro' Synagogue.
821. Hamburg, 1802, Joseph b. Menahem — Esther b. Eleazar.
822. Cochin (India), 1773: Eleazar Moses of London (great-grandson of Glückel v. Hameln) and Esther (Elias?): decoration in gold, in characteristic Cochin style.
823. Avignon 1764, St. Paul-St.-Paul: no illumination, but 13 signatures (including that of the שושבין both of bride and of bridegroom): similarly in the following specimens.
824. Carpentras, 1783, Joseph b. Aaron-Zipporah b. Saul.
825. Nîmes, 1801, Saul b. Mordecai-Sarah b. Joseph.
826. Nîmes, 1813, Crémieux-Valabrègues.
827. Cochin, 1880, of 'Black' Jews: decoration in colour.
828. Cochin, 1880, of 'White' Jews: decoration in colour.
829. Bokhara, 1852: leather.
830. Tiberias, 1842: Abulaffia-Marache: illuminated.
831. Damascus, 1872, Belilios-Levi: paper, with somewhat garish illumination. (This applies also to the following specimens).
832. Damascus, 1870, Cohen-Cohen.
833. Damascus, 1864, David Cohen-Reyna b. Joseph.
834. Damascus, 1852, Levi-Baruch.
835. Damascus, 1872, Perez-Perez.
836. Damascus, 1875, Farhi-Levi.
837. Damascus, 1863, Sassoon-Harrari (with תנאים).
838. Damascus, 1897, Levi-Levi.
839. Bayonne, 1763, Bernal-Ferro: vellum (illuminated).
840. Bayonne, 1702, Rodriguez Franco-Lopes: Black and white decoration: vellum.
841. Corfu 1666, Ashkenazi-Ashkenazi: illuminated, vellum (this text has many characteristic clauses, e. g. the date from the year of the Destruction of the Temple).



842. Gibraltar, 1849, Abenaim-Nahon, illuminated: vellum.
843. Gibraltar, 1872, Benatar-Athias, illuminated: vellum.
844. Constantinople, 1863, Habib-Abulaffia: illuminated.
845. Damascus, 1848.
846. Smyrna, 1918.
847. Cairo, 1897: Karaite.
848. Cairo, 1880: Karaite.
849. Nablous, 18th century: Dafni family (Samaritan).
850. London, 1754: R. Isaac Mendes Belisario-Sarah Miranda.  
in copper-plate border engraved by De Burgh; vellum.

## PIYYUTIM FROM THE GENIZA COLLECTION OF DAVID KAUFMANN

By ALEXANDER SCHEIBER

Professor A. Marx is the only one of the experts on the Geniza who knows of the Geniza Collection of the Kaufmann Library belonging to the Hungarian Academy of Science.<sup>1</sup> For this reason he is likely to welcome in his Jubilee Volume some unknown Piyyutim from the Kaufmann Geniza, reverently offered by the present writer to the great scholar and the great patron of scientific research. Of him Jewish learning expects the model Catalogue of the MSS of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, including the Geniza-material. One of the pieces published here (III. 3.) happens to complement the Geniza fragment Nr. 909 of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. This one fact proves how indispensable is the *Corpus of Geniza Piyyutim*, as proposed lately.<sup>2</sup> It is to be noted that none of the texts — except the Appendix — published here figures in the Geniza Catalogue compiled by Solomon Widder,<sup>3</sup> because I found them after the appearance of his work.

### I. *A Poem of Moses Ibn Chiquitilla*

Moses Ibn Chiquitilla who wrote verses both in Hebrew and Arabic, is mentioned by Moses Ibn Ezra as one of the best poets.<sup>4</sup> However, only few of his poems have reached us.<sup>5</sup> So

<sup>1</sup> See A. Marx: The Importance of the Geniza for Jewish History, *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, XVI, 1946–1947, p. 185; it is not even mentioned by A. M. Habermann (הגניזה Jerusalem, 1944) and P. E. Kahle (*The Cairo Geniza*, London, 1947).

<sup>2</sup> M. Zulay: A Plea for a "Corpus of Genizah Piyyutim." *The Journal of Jewish Studies* I, 1948, pp. 111–115.

<sup>3</sup> *Semitic Studies in Memory of Immanuel Löw*. Ed. A. Scheiber. Budapest, 1947. Hebrew section, pp. 15–113.

<sup>4</sup> שירת ישראל. Translated by B. Halper. Leipzig, 1924, p. 69.

<sup>5</sup> S. Poznański—I. Davidson, *HUCA*, I, 1924, pp. 599–601.

far it is thanks to the keenness of H. Brody that most of his extant poetical works were discovered.<sup>6</sup> Twelve lines of the Piyyut לְכָל קִרְבָּן in the supplement appended to סדר רב (II. Warsaw, 1865, p. 24b)<sup>8</sup> are to be found on p. 1b of a one-leaf fragment of the Kaufmann Geniza (Nr. 141, paper, 11×14.5 cm.). As its title is וְלֹא מֹשֶׁה בֶּן נִקְטִילָה זֶל this piece evidently is also by Moses Ibn Chiquitilla. In view of its textual variants, we think its publication is not superfluous. Like the poem Nr. 2, edited by Brody (p. 73), line 5 of this poem also makes use of Is. XXXIII.22 (יִי מַלְכֵנוּ הוּא יוֹשִׁיעֵנוּ). The variants from the printed text are marked by ע.

וְלֹא מֹשֶׁה בֶּן נִקְטִילָה זֶל

קִרְבָּן לְכָל קִרְבָּן	הִיא קִרְבָּן לְשׁוֹעִינוּ
כִּי שִׁמְךָ שִׁיחֵרְנוּ	מִעֲרֵשׁ יִצְוֵינוּ
וּבְשִׁמְךָ אֲתָנוּ	לְכַבּוֹשׁ תַּעֲחוּעֵינוּ
יְיָ מַלְכֵנוּ	הוּא יוֹשִׁיעֵנוּ

5

פִּזְמוֹ

בִּי יְיָ חֲסִינוּ	זָכְרוּ שְׁעִשְׁוֹעֵינוּ
מִתּוֹךְ צוֹקוֹתֵינוּ	וּמִלֶּחֶץ קוֹבְעֵינוּ
אֲנֵנוּ צוֹר יִשְׁעֵנוּ	אֵל תִּפֶּן לְרִשְׁעֵנוּ

וּבְשִׁמְךָ

10

מְגִדֵּל עֵץ שֵׁם יְיָ	אֵל צִלּוֹ נִבְרַחָה
וּבִצְרָתָהּ לָנוּ	עַל רַחֲמֵיוֹ נִבְטַחָה

- 3 שִׁמְךָ עַל חֲסִדְךָ. 4 אֲתָנוּ עַל אֲחֵאֲנוּ (וְכֵן צ"ל).  
 7 זָכְרוּ עַל זָכְרוֹ. 8 צוֹקוֹתֵינוּ עַל צִדְקוֹתֵינוּ (בְּטַעוֹת).  
 10 וּבְשִׁמְךָ עַל כִּי בְשִׁמְךָ אֲחֵאֲנוּ וּלְכַבּוֹשׁ תַּעֲחוּעֵינוּ. ה' מַלְכֵנוּ.

<sup>6</sup> מִשִּׁירֵי ר' מֹשֶׁה הֶכְהֵן אֲבֵן נִקְטִילָה *Studies of the Research Institute for Hebrew Poetry*, III, 1936-1937, pp. 67-90.

<sup>7</sup> Davidson: *Thesaurus of Mediaeval Hebrew Poetry*, III, p. 349, p. Nr. 462.

<sup>8</sup> See also A. Marx: *Untersuchungen zum Siddur des Gaon R. Amram* *Jahrbuch der Jüdisch-Literarischen Gesellschaft* V. 1907, p. 349.

II. *Reshut of Adonim Halevi b. Nissim from Fās*

The paper MS Nr. 142 of the Kaufmann Geniza comprises 4 pages (14×18 cm.). On p. 1a a poem for Yom Kippur is to be found under the title סדר לצום רבא and beginning with אהבה צדק ותשנא רשע.<sup>1</sup> On pp. 1b–2b a Reshut for שבת החודש is to be found. At first sight the authorship of Dunash Ibn Labrat would be the most reasonable to assume.<sup>2</sup> However, further researches show it to be the work of אדונים הלוי בירבי מסימו four lines of whose poem, beginning with בכו עמי בני אמי, were edited by Pinsker.<sup>3</sup> According to a private communication of M. Zulay of 25 April 1948, the correct reading should be בירבי ניסים. In the מהזור רומניא this poem is annexed to a Qina attributed to Joseph Ibn Abitur which begins with the words בכו עמי וגם ספרו<sup>4</sup> and which was lately reprinted by J. Schirrmann.<sup>5</sup>

[1b] זה הרשות אשר ארש רבנא ומר אדונים הלוי אשר ממדינת פאס  
ביר ניסים נע לדרוש בו בשבת החודש הזה לכם וזה הוא נסח.

והגות לבנו הגיון תשבחות	ארשת שפתינו פתח הוריות	
ומרומם על כל ברכה ותהלה	לברך הנעלה ומתנשא לכל לראש	
הבדר מבלי להימנות	האחר מבלי להישנות	5
השניא ולא נרע מספר שניו ולא חקר	ההוה מבלי שריות	
כי כל הקדומים חדשים מדובקים	הקדים כל קדם ולא קדם קדמו	
כי כל האחרים חצבים ונתחים	האחיר כל אחדים והוא לבדו אחר	
כי כל הטרומים [עושימו] [ט]רמם	הטרם כל טרם ולא טרם טרמו	
כי כל הדמיונות בגבול נתאים	יצר כל דמויות והוא לא ידומה	10
העריך כל ערך והוא לא יוערך	חוקר על חקר והוא לא יחקרו	
ברא כל עין ונעלם מעין	כי ההרגשות לא תשיגו	

<sup>1</sup> Davidson: Op. cit. I, p. 60, א. Nr. 1262.

<sup>2</sup> See N. Allony, דונש בן לבראט שירים, Jerusalem, 1947.

<sup>3</sup> לקוטי קדמוניות, Wien, 1860. Appendix, p. 138.

<sup>4</sup> See Davidson: Op. cit. II, p. 27, ב. Nr. 612. בכנו אחים.

<sup>5</sup> בכנו אחים, Tom. 3 (XIII). Fascicul. 1, Jerusalem, 1939, pp. 28–29; 74 (here only part of the אדונים acrostich is extant).

I thank M. Zulay for the Hebrew notes which are his.

11 גיל משובש וציל: חוקר כל חקר והוא לא יחקר (או: יחקר).



הוא יש בלבבות וודאי בטוחות  
וראשית ואת אחרונים הוא בלא תכלה  
אל יש והציב יש נצב  
נחלקים לארבעה ראשים  
אמותם שלושה ממולימו שבעה  
ספורים בעשרה כולם נאמנים

ראש כל ראשון הוא בלא ראשון  
ואחרית המנצין הנמצא מאין  
באור לא נתפש וגמ... ס חצב  
במאמר ולא בינע  
פשוטמו יוד בית  
בשלושה עדים נכוחים למבין בשלושה  
ספרים

עין כל ראשונית קדומה אלפים  
קנויה ראש יוסד והיא ראשית דרך  
אצילה ששה חצביה שבעה  
קראויה יעקב עדי ארוניה  
ראשון מחצבתם מרום מראשון  
וכסא הכבוד הנכון מאז  
וצרי הטרום בטרם יולדו  
[2a] כולם נמשכים אדוקים נצבים  
עמלהו לעולם ממלכת כוהנים  
בשמרם עקב רב ללמוד וללמד  
בעולם הנידון בארבעה פרקים  
בכ זה באלול נבראים  
תכונים בורת כלולים בשליש  
ואש פלדות האור בחזקתו נברא  
שמשו כמנהג שלשתם לשלושה  
קיסרונם ריצת מושל החושך  
להיות דה תתעז אושיות לבחרד  
להבדיל גם למשול ולהיותם אותות  
האותות ראשית למכסי השעות  
והשעה ראשית לערכי הימים  
וימים נחלקו לטומאה וספירה  
והחדש ראשון למלאות החדשים  
מהם מחזור יט והוא צורך העת  
ומילי אחרניאאתא מרבנות רחיות  
וארבעה ליון מסורת מועדים

עלילת נמצאים מרומה יומים  
וראש כוכבי רומה וראש עפרות תבל  
קדומי עולם עלו במחשבה  
הגיונה יהגו תמיד לא ימוש  
בם ינון השם אשר לפני ש[משן]  
ותפתה וגן עדן ערוכים מאתמול  
הרים וגבעות ופרי תוצאותם  
מובאי אהב מאז ועדי עד  
ונין צאצאימו לפניו נכונים  
ראשית המצות לעשות ולעשות  
וגם הוא יפרד לארבעה ראשים  
ארבעה אמות במוזנים לעלות  
מדורים בשועל אסופים בחופן  
סדר וחרס וכוכבי ממשלה  
נחלקו בקיטרוג לעשרים ותכלי תתח  
כי היא מנת כוסו ומרת גורלו  
משלשה ותרעב ועד יזב בלא חלק  
למועדים וזמנים ולימים ושנים  
וסימנם אפשעה ומחציתה מתק  
כח עם לו תשצג לקדש החדשים  
וכיפור ותמידים ומועדי גליות  
ושנים נחלקו לעשר מחזורות  
שבעה כבראשית והנשאר ולכל  
שערים ארבעה והרחיות שמונה  
סימן ראשימו על אדו הראש

28 לעשות ולעשות) כנראה ט"ס, וצ"ל לשמור ולעשות (או: לעשות ולהעשות).  
37 וסימנם אפשעה ומחציתה מתק] כוונתו לומר שפלת, אפשעה' בישעיה כ"ז, ד' משמשת  
סימן לחלוקת השעה ל 1080 חלקים: א"ף שעה ומחציתה, מתק"מ=תק"מ.  
43 וארבעה ליון] ולי נראה שצריך להיות: לאוין, ורצונו לומר: ארבעה סימנים המתחילים  
ב.לא' נמסרו לקביעת מועדים: לא אדו ראש, לא בדו פסח וכו', ואעפ"י שיש מביאים יותר  
מארבעה, נראה שהמחבר לא הכיר אלא ארבעה.



גם לא יאשמו ולא יהיה קצף	לחזק גם לעשות להיות עם הטוב
להפר ולהנחיל ושווא ראש מלקוח	וראשי האבות למטות שלישיה
להכן ולסער במשפט ובצדקה	80 כצוי המצוה לאות ראשי עם
לנצר התעורה עומדת לער	לרבץ התעורה צוי הר חורב
	.....

### III. *Piyyutim for Yom Kippur*

Nr. 143 of the Kaufmann Geniza is a parchment page (24×21 cm.). It is a fragment of a Prayer-Book for Yom Kippur with 5 Piyyutim, of which 3 are edited here: 1. (P. 1a). A complete alphabetical Piyyut by an unknown author. 2. (P. 1b). An alphabetical Piyyut. It was edited up to the letter  $\aleph$  by Joseph Marcus<sup>1</sup> as MS 909 of the E. N. Adler Collection of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. The variants from his text are marked by the letter  $\mathfrak{m}$ . 3. (P. 1b). A Reshut to an Abodah of an unknown author. The fragment to the letter  $\aleph$  was published by I. Elbogen from MS. Heb. f. 21. fol. 64b of the Bodleian Library.<sup>2</sup> In the Kaufmann Collection we have the whole Reshut and also the beginning of the Abodah. The variants from the text edited by Elbogen are marked by  $\aleph$ .

#### 1

האדיר בנובהי שחקים  
הבן מ[ס]ח[ר]י עמקים  
הגאון וגדוריו זיקים  
הרובר ושוקר להקים  
5 ההדור ברקיע שחקים  
הודיי במקלות עתיקים  
הזך ומאמריו מבהיקים  
החוצב בקולו ברקים

<sup>1</sup> ננוי שירה ופיוט מראשי הפייטנים והמשוררים הקדמונים I, New York, 1933, p. 96; cf. I. Davidson, *HUCA*, XII–XIII, 1937–1938, p. 759. Nr. 466.

<sup>2</sup> *Studien zur Geschichte des jüdischen Gottesdienstes*, Berlin, 1907, p. 183. Nr. XVII; cf. Davidson: *Thesaurus*, I, p. 70,  $\aleph$ . Nr. 1510.

הטהור וטס לרום יצוקים  
 10 היועץ ומשפטיו צדיקים  
 הכביר ושנאנו משיקים  
 הלוהט ומחריב עמק  
 המרפא מזיח אפיקים  
 הנישא לידע ממרחקים  
 15 הסח ונותן חוקים  
 העוטה עוז מפי יונקים  
 הקרוב לקרב רחוקים  
 הרוצה ענות נאנקים  
 השת לראש חוסים ענקים  
 20 התוביע משפט לעשוקים

## 2

אתוים עדיך להלוך  
 באומרם אדיר  
 גשים להפיל תחנוני  
 דוברים עיניך ברוך  
 5 הנישא ונושא ונעלם  
 וכסא כבודו  
 זמרי כי נאו לחיך  
 חלי והמליכי  
 [אלהיך] טוב היה לנו ריציון  
 10 יה השמיענו נעלה  
 כשומרך חסד אלף דור  
 לנצח תתקדש בכל  
 מלכותך לכל גלויה  
 נקה מפשע סוחחי  
 הללויה  
 15 סוד נואמך לנו ערוך  
 עבור כן [נאמר] שמך  
 פלא עשיתה והורעתה

2 באומרם] מ באימרה. 4 עיניך ברוך] מ בענין ימלוך. 5 ונושא] מ נשגב. 6 כבודו] מ כבודך ישב. 8 אלהיך] השלמתי ע"פ מ. 9 ריציון] מ לרציון. 10 נעלה ציון] מ נעלה לציון. 11 אלף] לאלף. 12 תתקדש] מ יתקדש שמך לדור ודור. 15 ערוך] מ ערוד (בטעות). 16 נאמר] השלמתי ע"פ מ.







C. 44

ל' א' א"ל

לילה ליל

84 UNLD

[illegible]

The Jewish Theological Seminary of Hungary is about to start the edition of the Ginzé Kaufmann. This systematic and annotated edition will contain all the texts of the Collection.

## A NEW BIBLE TRANSLATION

### Preliminary Studies\*

By ALEXANDER SPERBER

§ 1. Some thirty years ago, the Jewish Publication Society of America published a volume under the title *The Holy Scriptures according to the Masoretic Text. A New Translation* (Philadelphia 1917).<sup>1</sup> In the PREFACE, mention is made of already existing English translations of the Hebrew Bible with a brief evaluation of their respective merits. But in conclusion, the need for this *New Translation* is stressed: "The most popular, however, among these translations (scil. among English-speaking Jews) was that of Leeser, which was . . . the accepted version in all the synagogues of the United States . . . . With the advance of time and the progress made in almost all departments of Bible study, it was found that Leeser's translation would bear improvement and recasting." (*Preface*, p. V). Though speaking only of "improving on" and "recasting" the work of Leeser, the editors offer a virtually new translation. Of course, the works of

\*The following abbreviations and symbols are being used in this paper: AV=The Authorized Version. — RV=The Revised Version. — JPS=*The Holy Scriptures* (Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia 1917). — TRL=A. Sperber: "Hebrew based upon Greek and Latin Transliterations", *HUCA* 1938. — HPT=A Sperber, "Hebrew based upon Biblical Passages in Parallel Transmission", *HUCA* 1939. — HPh=A. Sperber, "Hebrew Phonology", *HUCA* 1941. — PRM=A. Sperber, "Problems of the Masora", *HUCA* 1943. — HG=A Sperber, "Hebrew Grammar", *JBL* 1943. — BE=A. Sperber, "Biblical Exegesis", *JBL* 1945. — Two vertical strokes (//) separate the two components of a doublet. — The English translations, when within "quotation marks", are taken from JPS; but when in *Italics*, they represent my own interpretation of the passage.

<sup>1</sup>I noticed only two printer's-mistakes: Lev 18.30: "these (abominable)", read: "the"; Hos. 8.12: "never (so many)", read: "ever".



its forerunners were made use of. Already the title-page indicates that this new venture was performed "with the aid of previous versions"; and in the *Preface* the editors are even more outspoken and explicit: "In preparing the manuscript . . . Professor Margolis took into account the existing English versions" (ib., p. VI). "We are . . . deeply grateful for . . . the Authorized Version with its admirable diction . . . as well as for the Revised Version with its ample learning . . . . The editors have . . . used these famous English versions." (ib., p. VIII).

The aim of this new translation being to "give to the Jewish world a translation of the Scriptures done by men imbued with the Jewish consciousness" (ib., p. VII), it is only natural that "as to the text and order of the biblical books, . . . it follows Jewish tradition" (ib., p. VIII). "Even with regard to the latest book of the Scriptures, we read its text substantially in the form in which the great Rabbi Akiba read it . . . . In that system (scil. "by which the sacred text was guarded"), the letters were actually counted . . . , to the end that no alterations should creep in . . . . Not only does the text known as the masoretic represent the text current in the Synagogue with regard to consonants, but also with regard to its signs standing for vowels and accents . . . . A translation must naturally follow the guide of the latter" (ib., p. IX). "A translation . . . can follow only one text, and that must be the traditional" (ib., p. X).

With a program as indicated above to guide the various translators of the respective Biblical books, the publishers were justified in adding *according to the Masoretic Text* as a subtitle in order to characterize this work.

§ 2. But the question may be asked: And was this program really put into practice? Do the actual facts substantiate the claim laid down in the program? I am afraid, the answer must be in the negative. For even a cursory examination of certain

Isaiah-passages, picked at random, will reveal a strikingly different attitude towards the Masoretic Text: there is apparent a disregard for the consonants and their vocalization, as established in the Masoretic Text.

Isa 13.20: יִרְבְּצוּ: "make their fold" = יִרְבְּצוּ; elsewhere the hiph'il is translated as causative, cf. Jer 33.12: מְרַבְּצִים: "causing . . . to lie down", Ezek 34.15: אֶרְבִּיצֵם: "I will cause them to lie down".

Isa 14.30: יִהְרַג: "shall be slain" = יִהְרַג.

Isa 17.5: קָצִיר: "the harvestman" = קָצִיר.

Isa 28.18: וְנִפְרָ: "shall be disannulled" = וְנִפְרָ.

Isa 28.25: שׁוּרָה: "in rows" = שׁוּרָה.

Isa 29.5: יְרִיךְ: "thy foes" = יְרִיךְ.

Isa 30.19: יָשָׁב: "that dwellest" = יָשָׁב.

Isa 30.21: תִּמְיִינוּ: "ye turn to the right hand" = תִּמְיִינוּ.

Isa 34.13: הָצִיר: "an enclosure" = הָצִיר.

Isa 40.10: בְּחֹזֶק: "as a Mighty One" = בְּחֹזֶק.

Isa 40.17: מֵאֲפָס: "as things of nought" = מֵאֲפָס; cf. parallel בְּאֵין: "as nothing."

Isa 42.4: יִרוּץ: "he shall (not . . .) be crushed" = יִרוּץ.

Isa 56.5: לֹא: "(I will give) them" = לָהֶם.

Isa 57.3: וְתֹנֶה: "and the harlot" = וְתֹנֶה.

For additional instances cf. §§ 10, 16b and 18b *passim*. All these emended readings can be found listed in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* as corrections of the Masoretic Bible Text, suggested by modern Biblical scholars. Instances of disagreement in the person, the gender or the number between subject and predicate, or between several closely connected verbs, the adjustment of which forms a very substantial part of the activities of the Textual Criticism of the Bible<sup>2</sup> were disregarded here, since the English

<sup>2</sup> Cf. my "Biblical Hebrew" in the forthcoming 1949 volume of the *PAAJR*.

language does not lend itself to an imitation of these characteristics of the Hebrew style; the translators simply had to follow the rules of English syntax.

§ 3. We should not be hasty in our judgment, but take the history of the genesis of the JPS translation into consideration: it might be — theoretically reasoning — that translations like those noted above were taken over from the previously existing English translations, thus attesting, it is true, to the new translator's neglect of duty in failing to check up on them, but not implying his disregard for the very task which he was supposed to perform: the preserving of the Masoretic Text. But a comparison of JPS with AV and RV reveals that though a translation of the passages under scrutiny according to the Masoretic Text did exist, the editor of the JPS nevertheless preferred a rendition, which involved a break with the Masoretic tradition and with their own program:

- Isa 13.20: יִרְבְּצוּ: RV: make their flocks to lie down there  
AV: make their fold there = JPS
- Isa 14.30: יִהְרֹג: AV: and he shall slay  
RV: shall be slain = JPS
- Isa 29.5: יִזְרֹךְ: AV: thy strangers  
RV: thy foes = JPS
- Isa 30.19: יֵשֵׁב: AV and RV: shall dwell  
JPS: "that dwellest"
- Isa 40.10: בְּחִזֹּק: AV: with strong (hand)  
RV: As a mighty one = JPS
- Isa 40.17: מֵאַפִּס: AV and RV: less than nothing  
RV *marginalis*: as a thing of nought = JPS
- Isa 56.5: לוֹ: RV *marginalis*: Heb. him  
AV and RV: them = JPS



§ 4. There exists, as we have seen, a discrepancy between the JPS translation's claim to be *according to the Masoretic Text* (with the definition of this term as given in the *Preface*) and the actual facts. With a scholar of rank like the late Professor Max L. Margolis heading the editorial board as editor-in-chief, it would be ridiculous to assume their unawareness of this discrepancy. Those interested in the JPS translation are acquainted with the huge volume of *Notes on The New Translation of the Holy Scriptures, prepared by the Former Editor-in-Chief Dr. Max L. Margolis (For Private Circulation Only)*, which gives eloquent evidence of the penetrating and painstaking endeavors of Margolis. I have, therefore, not the slightest doubt that these observations did not simply escape his attention. And nevertheless, not one of these or other deviations from the Masoretic Text that are reflected in JPS, is discussed or even mentioned in the *Notes*. The only explanation of this puzzling situation I can think of is: American Israel needed an English Bible to comply with its religious needs; consequently, the translation had to emphasize its being based strictly upon the Hebrew Bible of the Synagogue, i. e. the Masoretic Text. But as a scholar, Margolis had to comply "with the advance of time and the progress made in almost all departments of Bible study." He thus — unwittingly, perhaps — proved that a strict adherence to all the *minutiae* concerning the consonants and the vocalization, as embodied in the Masoretic Text, can no longer be made a *conditio sine qua non* for a Jewish Bible translation.

In fairness to Professor Margolis and his work I had to use the terminology of those days and speak of *the* Masoretic Text, in the singular. This, of course, can no longer be regarded as correct; for in PRM (pp. 334–70) I demonstrated after examining three independent Masoras that they all disagree with one another and even contradict their own respective texts. Now, the fact alone that one of these Masoras (in *Biblia Rabbinica*, Bomberg, Venice



1524/5) by virtue of its being repeatedly reproduced in print, has become more widely known, does not entitle us to regard it as *the* Masora κατ' ἐξοχήν. And even Jacob ben Chayim, the editor of this Masora, often explicitly calls attention to the self-contradictory character of the Masoretic tradition; cf. especially PRM p. 370 ff.

§ 5. But Hebrew consonants and their vocalization are merely like clay in the hands of the interpreter of the Bible; and it is the grammarian with his theories concerning phonology, morphology and syntax, which puts the spirit of life into these otherwise disjointed words and shapes them into a sentence. Hebrew grammar, on the other hand, is based upon the observation and classification of the many philological phenomena of the language of the Bible. And who is in a better position to notice these phenomena, than the translator of the Bible himself, he who has to find a suitable exegesis for every passage in the Scriptures. We must not expect him to adhere strictly to the grammatical theories of his day; for such theories, while quite fitting to explain certain Biblical passages, may prove inadequate if applied to others. In such cases the translator could actually prepare the ground for the coming grammarian by calling attention to his observations, which however, he never does. I shall demonstrate this on a few examples.

§ 6. The verbal tenses (again speaking in the terminology of thirty years ago) were known as perfect and imperfect. As a matter of fact, JPS does its best to translate a Hebrew verb in the perfect with the corresponding English verb in the past tense, and an imperfect with a future tense. But this method cannot be applied consistently. For "a translator is not a transcriber of the text. His principal function is to make the Hebrew intelligible" (*Preface*, p. X):

Hos 2.1: יֹאמַר . . . יֹאמַר: "(that which) was said . . . (it) shall be said"

Zech 8.14, 15: וְזָמַמְתִּי . . . וְזָמַמְתִּי: "I purposed . . . : . . . do I purpose"

Hos 6.1: יָרָה . . . טָרַף: "He hath torn . . . He hath smitten"

Hos 8.7: יִקְצְרוּ . . . יִזְרְעוּ: "they sow . . . they shall reap"

These problems are now dealt with in my HG §§ 50 ff.

§ 7. "The principal peculiarity of the Hebrew verbal system is the construction with consecutive *waw* . . . . Thus the tenses seem to be inverted" (G. R. Driver: *Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System*, p. 85). JPS are at pains to translate verbal forms with consecutive *waw* with the inverted English tense. But here, too, consistency was unattainable, as the following examples will show. They are the result of a collation of 2 Sam 22 with Ps 18. The verbs in question appear in both these parallel sources in the identical form (tense, number and gender), the sole difference being that in one source a consecutive *waw* is prefixed. This should lead to the inverting of the tense of the English verb in the translation. But such a procedure was rejected by JPS, obviously due to their effort "to make the Hebrew intelligible"; and the *waw* was rendered by merely "and" or "also" like any ordinary conjunctive *waw*. Thus JPS offer additional proof for the correctness of my theories in HG §§ 46 ff. and 55 ff.:

Ps 18.7: וַיִּשְׁמַע (מהיכלו קולי): "(Out of His temple) He heard my voice"

2 Sam 22.7: וַיִּשְׁמַע (מהיכלו קולי): "And (out of His temple) He heard my voice"

Ps 18.12: וַיַּשֶּׁת (חשך): "He made (darkness)"

2 Sam 22.12: וַיַּשֶּׁת (חשך): "And He made (darkness)"

2 Sam 22.14: וַיִּרְעַם (מן שמים יהוה): "(The Lord) thundered (from heaven)"

Ps 18.14: (בשמים יהוה) וַיִּרְעַם: "(The Lord) also thundered (in the heavens)"

2 Sam 22.16: יִנָּלוּ (מסדות תבל): "(The foundations of the world) were laid bare"

Ps 18.16: וַיִּנָּלוּ (מוסדות תבל): "And (the foundations of the world) were laid bare"

Ps 18.39: אֶמְחֶצֶם (ולא יכלו קום): "I have smitten them through"

2 Sam 22.39: וְאֶמְחֶצֶם (ולא יקומון): "(I have . . .) and smitten them through"

Ps 18.39: יִפְּלוּ (תחת רגלי): "They are fallen (under my feet)"

2 Sam 22.39: וַיִּפְּלוּ (תחת רגלי): "Yea, they are fallen (under my feet)"

Ps 18.44: תִּפְּלֵטֵנִי (מריבי עם): "Thou hast delivered me"

2 Sam 22.44: וְתִפְּלֵטֵנִי (מריבי עמי): "Thou also hast delivered me"

§ 8. In the instances discussed in the preceding §§ 6 and 7, JPS sensed the impossibility of applying certain rules laid down by the grammarians and preferred to disregard them there. But they did not consider these rules to be invalidated altogether by such a procedure; on the contrary: wherever only feasible, they followed them. We, thus, have instances for the applicability of a rule, and again instances of exceptions to this rule. And here we find ourselves confronted with a new aspect to this problem: How to draw the dividing line between the instances for and against a given grammatical rule? Just how far are we to go with the application of the rule and when are we to deviate from it? In other words: When does a rendering cease to "make the Hebrew intelligible" and impresses the reader as merely a grammatical twist? Here, much depends on personal



taste and preferences; and I will frankly admit that my own taste and preferences are considerably different from those of the editors of the JPS translation as exhibited in their work.

§ 9. It is well known that the absolute form of the masculine noun in the plural ends in ם-י. The ending in י- on the other hand may indicate, according to the preceding vowel, one of the following three forms: a) the construct state of the plural (if vocalized י־); b) the pronominal suffix of the first person of the plural (if vocalized י־ or י־ָ), or c) of the singular (if vocalized י־). But, still, in order to discharge their task conscientiously, JPS had to treat forms ending in י- variously vocalized as *plurals absolutus*:

a) Amos 6.6: (יִין) בְּמִזְרְקֵי (הַשְּׁתִּים): "(That drink wine) in bowls"

b) Isa 19.9: חֹרְרֵי (וַאֲרָגִים) חֹרְרֵי: "(they that weave) cotton"

Jer 22.14: (וּקְרַע לוֹ) חֲלוּנָי: "(And cutteth him out) windows"

Ezek 13.18: (אֲצִילֵי) יָדַי: "elbows"

Amos 7.1: (וַהֲנֶה יוֹצֵר) גִּבֵּי: "(and behold, He formed) locusts"

c) Isa 38.12: (כְּאֹהֶל) רַעִי: "(As) a shepherd's (tent)"

Now this rule can no longer claim general applicability. So, why limit the exceptions to the instances listed above, and why not re-examine other nominal forms ending in י- as to whether their context does not advocate an interpretation as absolute plural?

2 Sam 22.24: מֵעֲוֹנִי: NOT: "from mine iniquity"

BUT: *from iniquity*

2 Sam 22.34: בְּמִוְתָּי: NOT: "my high places"

BUT: *high places*; on this unusual plural-formation cf. for the time being 2 Ki 25.4: הַחֲמִתִּים.



Isa 7.13: אֱלֹהֵי: NOT: "my God"

BUT: *God*; cf. parallel אֱנָשִׁים.

Isa 16.4: נִדְחֵי: NOT: "mine outcasts"

BUT: *the outcasts*; cf. v. 3: נִדְחִים.

Isa 37.29: וּמִתְּנִי . . . חֲתִי: NOT: "My hook . . . And My bridle"

BUT: *hooks . . . And bridles*

Isa 49.11: וּמִסְלֹתַי . . . הָרֵי: NOT: "My mountains . . . And My highways"

BUT: *the mountains . . . And the highways*

Isa 51.4: עַמִּי וְלְאוּמִי: NOT: "O My people . . . , O My nation"

BUT: *peoples . . . , nations*

Jer 49.25: מְשׁוֹשֵׁי (קִרִּית): NOT: "(The city of) my joy"

BUT: (The city of) *joy*

Hab 3.19: בְּמוֹתַי; cf. on 2 Sam 22.34

Zech 1.17: עָרֵי: NOT: "My cities"

BUT: *cities*

§ 10. In the days of the JPS it was considered characteristic for nominal forms with pronominal suffixes to exhibit the letter ' between the noun and the suffix, in order to indicate that the noun is in the plural. This *yod*, thus, was indicative of the number of the noun. (Now cf. HPT § 78 ff. and HG § 34, where I proved that this *yod* is merely a *mater lectionis*). The translator was often enough faced with the fact that the verb or adjective, closely connected with such a supposedly plural-form of a noun, was used in the singular. Here, too, JPS silently admitted the existence of exceptions to this rule by disregarding the implication of this *yod* on the number of the noun:

Deut 28.48: יִשְׁלַחְנִי . . . אֹיְבֶיךָ: "thine enemy whom . . . shall send"

1 Sam 19.4: מַעֲשָׂיו טוֹב (לך): "his work hath been very good"

Judg 13.12: יָבֹא דְבָרְךָ: "thy word cometh to pass"

Micah 4.11: וְנִתְחַזַּק . . . עֵינֵינוּ: "let our eye gaze"

But unfortunately JPS overlooked numerous other instances of the same nature, while in some of them they even apparently emended the obviously singular-form of the predicate into the plural, in order to co-ordinate their number with what they considered to be a plural-form of the subject:

Deut 21.10: וְנִתְחַזַּקְךָ אֹיְבֶיךָ (על): NOT: "thine enemies, and . . . delivereth them" (= וְנִתְחַזְקוּ)

BUT: *thy enemy, and . . . delivereth him*

Judg 19.19: עֲבָדֶיךָ: NOT: "thy servants"

BUT: *thy servant* (referring to himself)

2 Sam 24.13: (לפני) צָרֶיךָ וְהוּא (רדפך): NOT: "thy foes while they" (= וְהֵם)

BUT: *thy foe while he*

Isa 10.15: מְרִימֵיו: NOT: "them that lift it up"

BUT: *him that lifts it up*; cf. parallel מְנִיפוֹ

Isa 64.10: מַחְמְדֵינוּ הֵיחָה: NOT: "our pleasant things are" (= הָיוּ)

BUT: *our delight is*

Ps 37.31: (לא) תִמְעַד אֲשָׁרָיו: NOT: "None of his steps slide" (= תִמְעַדְנָה)

BUT: *His step doth not slide*

Ps 44.19: וְנִתְחַזַּקְנוּ אֲשָׁרֵינוּ: NOT: "Neither have our steps declined"

BUT: *Neither hath our step declined*

Prov 16.7: אוֹיְבָיו יִשְׁלָם: NOT: "He maketh (even) his enemies to be at peace"

BUT: *(Even) his enemy maketh peace*

§ 11. "The construct state occupies a key-position in our endeavor to understand the Hebrew noun" (HG § 68). A more detailed discussion of these problems will have to be postponed for a later and better suited occasion; it would be out of place here, since JPS are a translation of the Bible and not a Hebrew grammar. I shall limit myself to the examination of certain Biblical passages, which reflect the identical grammatical phenomenon, but are treated differently by JPS. In order to avoid projecting my own terminology (cf. HG § 71 ff.) to the period of the JPS, I shall speak of the first and the second noun of a construct state. All cases under discussion here have one characteristic feature in common: one of the two nouns has adjectival meaning.

#### A. THE NOUN WITH ADJECTIVAL MEANING INTERCHANGEABLY IN FIRST OR SECOND PLACE.

§ 12. This noun in the absolute state. Correctly identified as such by JPS:

Gen 43.12: מִשְׁנֶה וְכֶסֶף } "and . . . double money"  
Gen 43.15: וּמִשְׁנֶה כֶּסֶף }

Gen 49.32: מִקְנֵה הַשָּׂדֶה: "The field . . . which was purchased"

Lev 27.22: שָׂדֶה מִקְנֵתוֹ: "a field which he hath bought"

§ 13. The first or second noun, interchangeably, has a pronominal suffix:

Num 25.12: בְּרִיתִי שָׁלוֹם } NOT: "My covenant of peace"

Isa 54.10: וּבְרִית שְׁלוֹמִי } BUT: *the covenant of My peace*

Isa 22.18: מִרְכָּבוֹת כְּבוֹדֶךָ: "The chariots of thy glory"

Hab 3.8: מִרְכָּבוֹתֶיךָ יְשׁוּעָה: NOT: "Thy chariots of victory"

BUT: *the chariots of Thy victory*

§ 14. The second noun has a pronominal suffix:

Ps 79.1: **הַיֵּכָל קֹדֶשׁ**: "Thy holy temple"

Ps 65.5: **קֹדֶשׁ הַיֵּכָל**: NOT: "The holy place of Thy temple"

BUT: *Thy holy temple*

Nehem 9.5: **שֵׁם כְּבוֹד**: "Thy glorious Name"

Ps 79.9: **כְּבוֹד שְׁמֶךָ**: NOT: "the glory of Thy name"

BUT: *Thy glorious name*

Isa 44.12: **בְּזִרְעוֹ כָּחוֹ**: "with his strong arm"

Ps 111.6: **כֹּחַ מַעֲשָׁיו**: NOT: "the power of His works"

BUT: *His powerful works*

Ps 12.4: **שִׁפְתֵי הַלְקוֹת**: "flattering lips"

Prov 7.21: **בְּהַלֵּק שִׁפְתֶיהָ**: NOT: "With the blandishment of her lips"

BUT: *with her blandishing lips*

## B. THE SECOND NOUN HAS ADJECTIVAL MEANING

§ 15. This noun in the absolute state:

a) Correctly identified as such by JPS:

Ex 28.2: **בְּגָדֵי קֹדֶשׁ**: "holy garments"

1 Sam 21.5: **לֶחֶם חָל**: "common bread"

1 Sam 21.7: **לֶחֶם חֹם**: "hot bread"

1 Ki 20.31: **מְלָכֵי חֶסֶד**: "merciful kings"

Isa 61.4: **עָרֵי חָרָב**: "waste cities"

Ezek 23.6: **בְּחוּרֵי חֶמֶד**: "handsome young men"

Ezek 25.17: **בְּתוֹכָהֶן חֶמָה**: "with furious rebukes"

Zech 7.14: **אֶרֶץ חֶמְדָּה**: "pleasant land"



b) But instances like the following are of the same character:

Lev 10.17: **בְּמִקְוֵה הַקֹּדֶשׁ**: NOT: "in the place of the sanctuary"

BUT: *in the holy place*; identical in meaning with ib. 24.9: **בְּמִקְוֵה קֹדֶשׁ**.

Isa 28.1: **עֲטֹרַת גִּאוּן**: NOT: "the crown of pride"

BUT: *the proud crown*; cf. parallel the adjective **גָּבִל**.

Ps 107.4: **עִיר מוֹשָׁב**: NOT: "city of habitation"

BUT: *inhabited city*

Prov. 3.17: **דְּרָכֵי נֶעֱם**: NOT: "ways of pleasantness"

BUT: *pleasant ways*

§ 16: This noun has a pronominal suffix:

a) Correctly identified as such by JPS:

1) Isa 41.10: **בְּיָמִין צִדְקִי**: "with My victorious right hand"

Jer 12.10: **חֶלְקֶת חֲמֻדָּתִי**: "My pleasant portion"

2) Isa 52.1: **בְּגָדֵי תְּפָאֲרֶתְךָ**: "thy beautiful garments"

Isa 64.9: **עָרֵי קֹדֶשְׁךָ**: "Thy holy cities"

Jer 5.17: **עָרֵי מְבֻצָּרֶיךָ**: "thy fortified cities"

Ezek 16.18: **בְּגָדֵי רֻקְמָתְךָ**: "thy richly woven garments"

3) Isa 44.12: **בְּזִרְעוֹ כָּחוֹ**: "with his strong arm"

Isa 63.10: **רוּחַ קֹדֶשׁוֹ**: "His holy spirit"

Prov 10.15: **קִרְיַת עֹז**: "his strong city"

b) But instances like the following are of the same character:

1) Hab 1.12: **אֱלֹהֵי קֹדֶשִׁי**: NOT: my God, my Holy One  
(= **אֱלֹהֵי קֹדֶשִׁי**)

BUT: *my holy God*

Ps 4.2: **אֱלֹהֵי צִדְקִי**: NOT: "O God of my righteousness"

BUT: *my righteous God*

Ps 43.2: אֱלֹהֵי מַעֲוִי: NOT: "the God of my strength"

BUT: *my mighty God*; cf. ib. 31.5: כִּי אַתָּה  
מַעֲוִי; hence מַעֲוִי is an attribute of God and does  
not refer to man.

Ps 59.18: אֱלֹהֵי חַסְדִּי: NOT: "the God of my mercy"

BUT: *my merciful God*

2) Isa 49.19: וְאֶרֶץ הַרְסָתָךְ: NOT: "And thy land that hath been  
destroyed"

BUT: *And thy destroyed land*

Isa 49.20: בְּנֵי שְׂכָלֶיךָ: NOT: "The children of thy bereavement"

BUT: *thy children, o bereaved one*; cf. v. 21.

Micah 1.16: בְּנֵי תַעֲנוּגֶיךָ: NOT: "the children of thy delight"

BUT: *thy delightful (or: dandled) chil-  
dren*

3) Lev 26.19: וְאַזְנוֹן עֲזֹכֶם: NOT: "the pride of your power"

BUT: *your mighty pride*

### C. THE FIRST NOUN HAS ADJECTIVAL MEANING

#### § 17. Correctly identified as such by JPS:

a) The second noun in the absolute state:

Gen 3.24: לַהֵט הַחֶרֶב: "the flaming sword"

Num 17.3: רִקְעֵי פָחִים: "beaten plates"

1 Sam 17.40: חֲלָקֵי אֲבָנִים: "smooth stones"

Isa 8.11: בְּחֹזֶקת הַיָּד: "with a strong hand"

Isa 28.11: בְּלִעְגֵי שִׁפָּה: "with stammering lips"

b) The second noun has a pronominal suffix:

Ps 20.7: יְשַׁע יְמִינוֹ: "His saving right hand"

§ 18: But instances like the following are of the same character:

a) The second noun in the absolute state:

Ex 13.3: בְּחֹזֶק יָד: NOT: "by strength of hand"

BUT: *with a strong hand*; cf. v. 9: בְּיָד חֲזָקָה.

Lev 7.21: בְּטִמְאַת אָדָם: NOT: "the uncleanness of man"

BUT: *an unclean man*; cf. the entire context.

Num 19.17: שָׂרַפְתָּ הַחֹטְאֹת: NOT: "the burning of the purification"

BUT: *the burned purification*; in v. 6:

שָׂרַפְתָּ הַפָּרָה, the heifer is still "burning"; but here he is already "burned" to ashes.

Isa 10.16: כִּי־קָדַח אֵשׁ: NOT: "like the burning of fire"

BUT: *like a burning fire* (= Isa 65.5: אֵשׁ יִקְדָּח)

Isa 51.13: חֲמַת הַמָּצִיק: NOT: "the fury of the oppressor"

BUT: *the furious oppressor*; cf. the following כֹּנֵן בָּאֵשׁ: "as he maketh ready", thus referring to הַמָּצִיק.

Joel 2.5: לֵהֵב אֵשׁ: NOT: "a flame of fire"

BUT: *a flaming fire* (= Isa 4.5: אֵשׁ לִהְבֶּה)

b) The second noun has a pronominal suffix:

Ex. 15.16: בְּגִדְלִי זְרוּעָךְ: NOT: "By the greatness of Thine arm" (= בְּגִדְלִי זְרוּעֶךָ)

BUT: *By Thy great arm*

1 Sam 16.7: גְּבוּהַ קוֹמָתוֹ: NOT: "the height of his stature" (= גְּבוּהַ קוֹמָתוֹ)

BUT: *his high stature*

Hos 13.8: סָגַר לִבָּם: NOT: "the enclosure of their heart"

BUT: *their shut-up heart*

Gen 27.16: חֲלָקֶת צְוֹאֲרָיו: NOT: "the smooth of his neck"

BUT: *his smooth neck*

Isa 1.16: רַע מַעַלְלֵיכֶם: NOT: "the evil of your doings"

BUT: *your evil doings* (=Zech 1.4:

וּמַעַלְלֵיכֶם הָרָעִים)

Jer 16.18: בְּנִבְלֹת שְׁקוּצִיהֶם: NOT: "with the carcasses of their detestable things" (=בְּנִבְלֹת שְׁקוּצִיהֶם)

BUT: *with their detestable abominations*

§ 19. My criticism of the JPS thus far had to be based upon the standard of Hebrew philological studies of thirty years ago (cf. § 4). But in the intervening period of time "progress has again been made in almost all departments of Bible study" — to use Dr. Margolis' own words — which should be reflected in the English Bible. Already in BE §§ 73 ff. I have offered a new interpretation to some two hundred Biblical passages, so as to put my own approach to the problems of Hebrew Grammar to the test. The following paragraphs present further evidence of the applicability of my grammatical theories to a new and better interpretation of the Bible.

§ 20. Gen 17.17: וְיָאֵם שָׂרָה הֵבֶת: ". . . Sarah, that is ninety years old" fails to render the הֵבֶת in הֵבֶת הָ; hence: *and as for Sarah, can a ninety years old woman bear children?*

Gen 29.34: הַפַּעַם // עֲתָה form a doublet (cf. BE § 65 f.); cf. v. 32: כִּי עֲתָה and v. 35: הַפַּעַם. The fact that the Hebrew text offers a doublet could be indicated in the translation by using different type for the components.



Gen 38.27: The spelling תַּאֲוִמִּים reflects the two possibilities of pronouncing the word: with the vowel *o*, cf. 25.24; תוֹמִים; and with the vowel *a*, cf. Ex 26.24: תַּאֲמִים (cf. HG §§ 37 and 38; also the vocalization of תַּמִּים in Ex 26.24). On one word representing a doublet, cf. BE § 66 (the first six examples).

Gen 41.34: וְחַמֵּשׁ: “and take up the fifth part” conveys no meaning at all in the context. Furthermore: no indication is given as to who was intended to do this task (whatsoever it may have been): Pharaoh himself, being the subject to the preceding verb וַיִּפְקֹד, or his appointees (cf. the plural וַיִּקְבְּצוּ in v. 35), in which case the singular of וְחַמֵּשׁ offers a difficulty. I, therefore, suggest to vocalize the word as inf. וְחַמֵּשׁ (cf. HPT § 101) and to translate: *and to mobilize*, or: *inventorize*.

Ex 20.3: אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים is not: “other gods”, but: *another god*. The context implies a singular; cf. 1 Sam 6.20: הָאֱלֹהִים הַזֶּה הַקָּדוֹשׁ with Josh 24.19: הוּא קִדְשִׁים הוּא; also: Ex 32.8: אֲשֶׁר הָעֵלּוּךְ . . . אֵלֶּה אֱלֹהֶיךָ with Nehem 9.18: זֶה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֲשֶׁר הָעֵלּוּךְ.

Ex 25.37: וְהָעֵלָה . . . וְהָאִיר (וְעָשִׂיתָ . . .). The two verbs are in the identical number and person, but refer to different subjects. I suggest to vocalize וְהָעֵלָה . . . וְהָאִיר as inf. (cf. HPT § 101).

Ex 32.35: עַל אֲשֶׁר עָשׂוּ אֶת הָעֵגֶל אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה אַהֲרֹן: “because they made the calf, which Aaron made” is not clear: who was responsible for the making of the calf? And how could the Israelites “make” the calf, after Aaron had done it? In a hitherto unpublished paper (cf. PAAJR, vol. VI, p. 2), Dr. Julian Morgenstern interpreted the root עָשָׂה in passages like 2 Ki 17.29: וַיַּהֲדוּ עֲשִׂים; ib. v. 30: וַאֲנָשִׁי בָבֶל עָשׂוּ; as meaning: to worship. Hence, our passage should be

rendered as: *because they had worshipped the calf, which Aaron had made*; cf. also Targum Onkelos.

Lev 25.49: מְשִׁאָר (בשרו) is a nominal form with prefix מ to שאר (cf. BE § 74 on Ex 12.4): *or his kinsman*.

Num 11.4: וְהֶאֱסָפוּ is onomatopoeitic, reflecting the hissing sound of a mob-gathering (סף, סף); hence translate: *the riffraff*.

Num 15.21: מֵרָאשִׁית (ערסתיכם) is a nominal form with prefix מ to ראשית; cf. in the identical meaning v. 20: רָאשִׁית ((ערסתכם)).

Num 16.27: יָצְאוּ // נָצְבִים is a doublet (cf. BE § 65 f.); “came out and stood” is evading the difficulty at issue; for it implies that they first “came out” and subsequently “stood”, while the tenses in Hebrew point to a reversed order.

Num 33.2: מוֹצְאֵיהֶם is an inflected form with preservation of the first vowel (cf. BE § 40).

Deut 14.11, 20: כָּל עוֹף טְהוֹר (v. 11) and כָּל צִפּוֹר טְהוֹרָה תֹאכְלוּ (v. 20) form a doublet (cf. BE § 65 f.).

Deut 21.6: (וכל זקני העיר ההוא) הַקְרִבִּים (אל החלל): “And all the elders of that city, who are nearest unto the slain man”. Is it thinkable that amongst “the elders of that city” are some “who are nearest”, and consequently others who are farthest “unto the slain man”? But הַקְרִבִּים refers to הָעִיר (cf. HG § 85): *which is nearest unto the slain man*.

Deut. 20.10: (כי תקרב אל עיר להלחם . . . וקראת . . .) לְשָׁלוֹם: An aggressive war, as described in the following verses, does not begin with “proclaiming peace”. The context allows for שָׁלוֹם (and its derivate תְּשָׁלִים v. 12) only one meaning: *surrender*.

§ 21. Judg 3.26: הִתְמַהֲמָהּ: an onomatopoeitic verb, emphasizing the slow progress of the action taken by Eglon’s servants (מה, מה) (cf. our pooh-pooh<sup>1</sup>).

- Judg 9.54: re-arrange (cf. BE § 72): וַיִּקְרָא אֶל הַנֶּעֱר נִשְׂא בָלְיוֹ: *Draw hastily thy sword.*
- Judg 16.18: re-arrange (cf. BE § 72): עָלוּ כִּי הַפַּעַם הִגִּיד לִי אֶת: *Come up for this time he hath told me all his heart.*
- 1 Sam 1.26: חִי נִפְשֶׁךָ אֲדֹנִי // חִי אֲדֹנִי is a doublet (cf. BE § 65 f.); cf. 1 Ki 3.17: חִי אֲדֹנִי, and 2 Sam 14.19: חִי נִפְשֶׁךָ אֲדֹנִי.
- 1 Sam 2.29: מִרְאשִׁית: cf. on Num 15.21.
- 1 Sam 4.6: קוֹל הַתְּרוּעָה הַגְּדוֹלָה הַזֹּאת: *this great noise of shouting*; קוֹל הַגְּדוֹלָה הַזֹּאת refer to קוֹל; cf. on Deut 21.6.
- 1 Sam 4.14: אֶת קוֹל הַצֶּעֱקָה: *the loud wailing.*  
קוֹל הַהֶמּוֹן הַזֶּה: *this loud excitement*; cf. 14.19: וְהַהֶמּוֹן with ib. v. 20: מְהוֹמָה, where both words are used in the identical meaning.
- 1 Sam 6.7: re-arrange (cf. BE § 72) and read: וַעֲתָה עֲשׂוּ עֲגֹלָה וְקַחוּ שְׁתֵּי פָרוֹת עֲלוֹת: *prepare you a new cart, and take two milch kine.*
- 1 Sam 20.23: עַד עוֹלָם. This agreement was to remain a secret for not more than one day only (unlike עַד עוֹלָם in v. 42, where the lifespans of זֶרַעִי and זֶרַעְךָ are included in the covenant); hence I would vocalize it as עַד עֲלוּם: *The Lord is a hidden (or: unseen) witness between me and thee*; cf. Gen 31.50: אֵין אִישׁ עִמָּנוּ רֹאֵה אֱלֹהִים עַד בֵּינִי וּבֵינְךָ.
- 1 Sam 20.38: מְהִרָּה is imper.; cf. on Ps 31.3.
- 1 Sam 25.6: לָחִי is the absolute form of the plural (= לחיים), cf. § 9: *Hail*.
- 2 Sam 20.13: הִנֵּה; on the vocalization with הִנֵּה (and not הִנֵּה), cf. on Isa 30.14.
- 1 Ki 3.11: הָבִין is a noun (= תְּבוּנָה: 5.9); cf. similarly Job 6.25: הִלְהוֹכַח and ib. v. 26: הִלְהוֹכַח.
- 1 Ki 8.37: בָּאֲרָץ שְׂעָרֵיו (= בְּשַׁעְרֵי אֲרָצוֹ: cf. on Prov. 31.13): *in the cities of their land.*



1 Ki 12.5: Divide: לָכוּ עַד שְׁלֹשָׁה יָמִים וְשׁוּבוּ אֵלַי: *Depart (now): after three days come again to me.*

1 Ki 14.15: מְכַעֲסִים refers as an attributive adjective to the preceding noun אֲשֵׁרֵיהֶם: *because they have made their Asherim that anger the Lord.* On this construction (= אֲשֵׁרֵיהֶם מְכַעֲסִים), cf. similarly Hag 1.4: בְּבִתֵּיכֶם סְפוּנִים: "in your ceiled houses"; Gen 42.19: אֲחֵיכֶם אֶחָד.

1 Ki 18.43: re-arrange (cf. BE § 72): שָׁבַע פְּעָמִים שָׁב: *And seven times he said (unto him): go again.*

2 Ki 3.4: אֵילִים צָמַר is a construct state (cf. HG § 77 3).

2 Ki 5.2: וַיָּצְאוּ נְדוּדֵימָּהּ וַאֲרָם יָצְאוּ (cf. 6.23, 13.20): *And the bands of the Arameans had gone out.*

2 Ki 12.9: (לְבַלְתִּי קָחַת כֶּסֶף), as compared with Jer 17.23: (וּלְבַלְתִּי קָחַת מוֹסֵר), is a case of reduction of the first vowel (originally: קָחַת) to שׂוּא (קָחַת); cf. similarly 2 Ki 23.11: נָקַם (אַחַת מִשְׁתֵּי נָתַן מֶלֶךְ), from נָתַן Judg 16.28: נָקַם (אַחַת מִשְׁתֵּי נָתַן מֶלֶךְ). The vocalization of the words under consideration with  $\bar{\text{a}}$  or  $\bar{\text{e}}$ , respectively, is irrelevant (cf. HPh § 50 ff.).

§ 22. Isa 1.4: זֶרַע מַרְעִים is parallel to בְּנֵי מַשְׁחִיתִים, and hence cannot be considered a construct state ("A seed of evil-doers"), but must be explained as a collective noun with its adjective in the plural (cf. HPT § 92): *An evil-doing seed.*

Isa 1.7: שְׁמָמָה (אַרְצָכֶם) is a verb, 3 pers. perf. (= שְׁמָמָה): "Your country is desolate"; but later on: וְשְׁמָמָה is a noun: *And a desolation like the destruction (wrought by) strangers.*

Isa 1.20: חֶרֶב (תֵּאָפֵּלוּ): *drought*; cf. Deut 28.22: וּבְחֶרֶב. Note also the antithesis in Lev 26.5: וְאָכַלְתֶּם לַחֲמֹכְכֶם לְשָׁבַע and ib. v. 19: וְנָתַתִּי אֶת שְׁמֵיכֶם בְּבִרְזָל, implying drought. In our verse, תֵּאָכַל is now to be vocalized as an active verb (תֵּאָכַלְוּ).



- Isa 1.23: וְחֻבְרֵי יִנְבִּים: "And companions to thieves" reflects only indirectly and, therefore, feebly on the princes themselves. Hence I see in וְחֻבְרֵי the plural to חֻבֵּר: *And gangs (or: bands) of thieves.*
- Isa 1.31: וּפְעָלוֹ, from פָּעַל — פָּעִלוּ\* — פָּעֵלוּ\* — till finally פָּעָלוּ cf. Ps 111 3; id. Jer 22.13; Isa 52.14.
- Isa 2.12: וְנִשְׁפָּל (ועל כל נשא) וְנִשְׁפָּה; perhaps: וְנִשְׁפָּה, the masculine form to וְנִשְׁפָּה (cf. BE § 79 on Jer 13.16). נִשְׁפָּה is used in connection with גְּבוּעוֹת, and נִשְׁפָּה with הָר (cf. 13.2), thus referring to both of them, as mentioned in v. 2 and v. 14.
- Isa 3.9: וְחִטָּאתָם בְּסֹדֶם הִגִּידוּ לֹא כִחְדוֹ: *And their sin in the manner of Sodom, they declare it (openly), they hide it not.*
- Isa 3.12: מַאֲשְׁרֵיךְ is parallel to וְדֶרֶךְ (hence: מְדַרְכֶּךָ?), and אֲרֻחֲתֶיךָ בִלְעוּ מִתְעִים: *And those that guide thee, confuse (or: entangle) thy paths.*
- Isa 5.13: צָחָה (צמא) is plural; cf. the parallel מְתִי (רעב) (cf. HPT § 68 and note 222 there).
- Isa 7.6: וְנִקְצְצָנָה: denominative verb, from קָץ: *and let us finish it up.* JPS: "and vex it", corresponds to a correction into וְנִצְקְנָה; cf. Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*.
- Isa 7.11: שְׁאֵלָה (= שאלה); cf. on Jonah 1.6.
- Isa 9.14: וְנִשְׁוֹא (פְּנִים) (זֶקֶן) וְנִשְׁוֹא: the ו is merely euphonic, so as to separate the two *nun* from one another (נִשְׁוֹא); cf. the parallel וְנִבְיֵא מוֹרֶה שֶׁקֶר. Hence translate: *The respected elder.*
- Isa 11.13: וְנִצְרְרֵי יְהוּדָה: *And the Judaeans that harass (or: the harassing Judaeans)* just as in the preceding and parallel קִנְאֵת אֶפְרַיִם it is Ephraim who does the envying; cf. also the end of the verse: וְיְהוּדָה לֹא יֵצֵר אֶת אֶפְרַיִם: *And Judah*

*shall not harass Ephraim.* Thus, in the first instance יהודה is in adjectival position, cf. § 11 ff.

Isa 17.13: re-arrange (cf. BE § 72): וְנָעַר בּוֹ מִמֶּרְחֶק וְנָס: *And He will roar at them from far off, and they shall flee.*

Isa 25.12: re-arrange (cf. BE § 72): הִשְׁפִּיל לְאַרְצָן הַגִּיַע עַד עָפָר: *He will lay low to the ground, bring to the dust;* cf. 26.5.

Isa 29.3: re-arrange (cf. BE § 72): וְצִרְתִּי עָלֶיךָ מְצָרֹת וְהִקִּמֹתָ עָלֶיךָ מָצָב.

Isa 30.10: נִכְחֹת, הוֹכִיחַ: *reproves* or: *rebukes*; cf. as contrast the parallel חֲלָקוֹת.

Isa 30.14: כָּתוּת is inf. (= כְּתוּת); on the interchange of ו and י, cf. TRL paragraph XXIII under ו, and HPh § 72 ff.

Isa 31.7: יְדִיכֶם חַטָּא: *your sinful hands*; cf. on 1 Ki 14.15 and Isa 35.4.

Isa 32.6: לְהָרִיק נַפֶּשׁ רָעֵב וּמִשְׁקָה צָמָא יַחְסִיר: "To make empty the soul fo the hungry". But the soul of the hungry is actually empty, and need not and cannot be made empty. Hence: *To keep empty the soul of the hungry, And to withhold the drink of the thirsty*; as contrast cf. Ps 107.9

Isa 35.4: אֱלֹהֵיכֶם נָקָם (יָבֵא): *The God of your vengeance, or: your vengeful God.* On the grammatical structure, cf. Hab. 3.8: מֶרְכָּבְתֶּיךָ יְשׁוּעָה; here, too, the suffix refers to the *nomen regens* (cf. HG § 71).

גְּמוּל אֱלֹהִים (= אֱלֹהִים גְּמוּל, cf. BE § 72), is a construct state (cf. HG § 77 3): *The God of recompense* (He will come).

Isa 40.10: בְּחֹזֶק is a noun, the masc. form to Judg 4.3: בְּחֹזֶקָה (cf. BE § 10): *with might*. Similarly: Ps 111.8: וַיֵּשֶׁר.

Isa 41.4: קָרָא still refers to מִי: (Who) calleth the generations.

Isa 44.23: מַתְחִיזוֹת אֶרֶץ is identical in meaning with Isa 51.6: הָאֶרֶץ מִתַּחַת: *the earth beneath*; cf. Isa 8.9: מְרַחֵקִי אֶרֶץ with

- ib. 33.17: אָרַץ מְרַחֵקִים, both identical in meaning with Isa 39.3: מְאַרֵץ רְחוֹקָה.
- Isa 45.15: מְסַתֵּר (אַל); denominative verb, from סָתַר, cf. Ps 91.1: *Thou art a protecting God*; cf. the parallel מוֹשִׁיעַ. Similarly in Isa 28.15: נִסְתָּרְנוּ: *do we find protection*.
- Isa 50.2: מְפָדוֹת is inf. (= מְפָדוֹת); cf. on Isa 30.14.
- Isa 50.4: לְשׁוֹן לְמוֹדִים: *a wise tongue*; cf. above § 15.
- Isa 51.3: re-arrange (cf. BE § 72): קוֹל תּוֹדָה וְזִמְרָה: *The voice of thanksgiving and song*.
- Isa 52.14: וְתֹארוֹ (= וְתֹארוֹ cf. 1 Sam 28.14); cf. on Isa 1.31. On the opposite development, cf. Isa 30.12: מְאַסְּכֶם, from the original form מְאֻסְכֶם.
- Isa 53.3: נְבוֹהָ וְחָדַל אִישִׁים (= אִישׁ נְבוֹהָ וְחָדַל; cf. BE § 72): *A man, despised and short-lived*; cf. Ps 89.48: וְזָכַר אֲנִי מָה חָלַד = וְזָכַר מָה חָלַד אֲנִי (חָלַד = חָדַל; cf. Ps 39.5: מָה חָדַל אֲנִי). (אִישׁ יָדוּעַ מְכַאֲבוֹת וְחָלִי) = אִישׁ יָדוּעַ מְכַאֲבוֹת וְחָלִי: *A man, familiar with pain and disease*; on יָדוּעַ, cf. Ruth 2.1: מוֹדָע: "kinsman."
- Isa 53.5: מְפַשְׁעֵנוּ is plural; cf. HPT § 81.
- § 23. Jer 2.25: מִיָּחָף is a noun (יָחָף); cf. the parallel מִצְמָאָה.
- Jer 4.24: הִתְקַלְקְלוּ is an onomatopoeic verb, imitating the roaring noise (perhaps: *reverberate*), hence, the parallel רָעָשִׁים is not: "they trembled", but: *they are tempestuous*.
- Jer 6.30: כֶּסֶף נִמָּאֵס the process of refining as described in v. 29 results in a separation of the refuse from the valuable metal, the silver. "Refuse silver" is therefore an illogical translation; for the metal obtained is either refuse or silver, but not both together. Hence, כֶּסֶף נִמָּאֵס corresponds to כֶּסֶף נִמָּאֵס (cf. BE § 72): *Refuse of silver*; cf. Isa 16.2: קָן מְשָׁלַח (= מְשָׁלַח קָן): *driven out from (their) nest*.



Jer 14.21: (שְׁמֶךָ) לְמַעַן; vocalize: לְמַעַן: *the dwelling-place of Thy name*; cf. the parallel כְּבוֹדְךָ כִּסֵּא; cf. also Jer 25.30: וּמִמָּעוֹן קִדְשׁוֹ.

Jer 15.18: נִצַּח: *overpowering*.

Jer 17.12: Divide: מֵרָאשׁוֹן מְקוֹם מְקֻדָּשׁוֹ: *A high throne of glory, Is our chief holy place*. מֵרָאשׁוֹן is a nominal form with prefix מ to רָאשׁוֹן.

Jer 18.21: הָרְגִי מוֹת: "slain of death" is a tautology; cf. 2 Ki 4.40: מוֹת בִּפְסִיר and translate: *plague-ridden*.

Jer 23.1: מְאַבְדִּים is here causative: *that let wander*, or: *cause to get lost*; cf. 50.6: צֹאן אֲבָדוֹת. Similarly Eccl. 3.6: לֹא־אֶבֶד (וְעַתָּה) לְבַקֵּשׁ.

Jer 23.23: מְרַחֵק and מְקַרֵּב are nominal formations with prefix מ to קָרַב and רָחַק, respectively; cf. on Prov 7.19.

Jer 23.28: דְּבַרִּי אֱמֶת (יְדַבֵּר): *let him speak My faithful word*; on אֱמֶת in adjectival meaning, cf. 14.13: שְׁלוֹם אֱמֶת: "assured peace".

Jer 50.9: קָהַל גּוֹיִם גְּדֹלִים: *a great assembly of nations* (cf. HG § 85).

Jer 50.17: שֶׁה פְּזוּרָה is collective ("a" sheep cannot be "scattered"!); and should be translated as a plural.

§ 24. Ezek 3.3: בְּטֶנְךָ תֹאכַל: "cause thy belly to eat"; but the "belly" does not "eat". Therefore: *feed thy belly*.

Ezek 4.13: לֶחֶמָם טָמֵא (אֵת . . . יֹאכְלוּ): *their unclean bread*. On the construction (טָמֵא, and not הַטָּמֵא), cf. on 1 Ki 14.15. טָמֵא cannot be explained as referring to בני־יִשְׂרָאֵל, since both verbs, יֹאכְלוּ (preceding) and אֲדִיחָם (following) treat it as a plural; and in v. 14 the prophet emphasizes that no prohibited *food* had hitherto come into his mouth. Cf. also Hos 9.3: וּבִאשׁוּר טָמֵא יֹאכְלוּ: "And they shall eat unclean food in Assyria."



Ezek 7.6: הִקְיִץ: denominative verb, from קִץ: *it endeth*.

Ezek 7.16: וּפָלְטוּ פְּלִיטֵיהֶם: *And some shall escape among them*.

On the construction and meaning of the suffix, cf. Num 12.6: יְהִיָּה נְבִיאָכֶם יְהוָה: *if there be a prophet of the Lord among you*. For another grammatical construction of the suffix in the identical meaning, cf. Josh 10.20: וְהַשְׂרִידִים: *and (only) remnant were left of them*.

Ezek 7.24: רָעִי (גוֹיִם): from the root רעה = רעע (cf. HG § 64): *destroyers of nations*.

Ezek 16.50: רָאִיתִי (בְּאִשָּׁר) is 2. pers. fem. (cf. HPT § 45): *as thou hast seen*.

Ezek 25.6: (יֵעֹן) מַחֲאֵף (יָד) וְרִקְעָף (בְּרִנָּל): construct inf. with suffixes. Such forms are vocalized with  $\bar{\text{a}}$  under the first radical as a rule; but here they appear with  $\bar{\text{e}}$ . This is additional proof for the correctness of our theory (cf. BE § 70) that originally this  $\bar{\text{e}}$  indicated the vowel *a*.

שָׂאֲמָךְ בִּנְפֶשׁ: "with the disdain of thy soul"; the suffix is appended to the مضى (cf. HG § 71).

Ezek 28.2: מוֹשֵׁב אֱלֹהִים יֹשְׁבְתִי: *I sit like a god, In the heart of the seas*.

Ezek 30.12: חֲרָבָה: noun to the verb חָרַב; with preservation of the first vowel (cf. BE § 40).

Ezek 35.12: נֶאֱצוּתִיךָ is an inflected form with preservation of the first vowel (cf. BE § 40).

Ezek 36.35: הִחְרַבְתָּ (וְהָעָרִים); originally \*הִחְרַבְתָּ: preservation of the first vowel (cf. BE § 40). The הָ was then changed into הַ, so as to indicate a short vowel.

Ezek 43.2: הִאֲרִיעַ (וְהָאָרֶץ): denominative verb, from אור: *and the earth became bright with His glory*. But Ps 31.17: הִאֲרִיעַ is causative: "Make to shine."

- § 25. Hos 1.9: *לֹא אֶהְיֶה לָכֶם*: *And I am not your* אֶהְיֶה; cf. Ex 3.14: *אֶהְיֶה שְׁלַחְנִי אֵלֵיכֶם*; cf. also here 2.25 (referring to our verse): *וְהוּא יֹאמֶר אֱלֹהֵי וְאִמְרָתִי לֹא עָמִי עָמִי אַתְּ*.  
 Hos 2.4: *כִּי הִיא לֹא אִשְׁתִּי וְאֲנֹכִי לֹא אִישָׁה*: *For is she not My wife, and am I not her husband?* (cf. HG §§ 87 and 88) An exclamation and not a statement. For if the verse is taken as a statement, then the terming of the incriminated acts as "adulteries" is not justified, since this refers to a married woman's transgressions only. *וְתָסֶר*: *So let her put away*.  
 Hos 3.1: *רַעֲיָתִי* is the husband or lover; cf. Cant 1.9, 15: *כָּלָה* in Cant 4.12: *beloved of her husband and yet an adulteress*. Hence the comparison *יְהוָה בְּתֹכְחָתָהּ*; for the Lord's love is compared to that of a husband, cf. 2.21: *וְאֶרְשָׁתִּיךָ*.  
*וְהֵם פְּנִים*: *yet they turn*.  
 Hos 3.2: the betrothal.  
 Hos 3.3: *תִּשְׁבְּ לִי*: *thou shalt wait for me*.  
*וְגַם אֲנִי אֶלֶיךָ*: *and so will even I (wait) for you*. In the simile: the Lord waits for Israel's return and does not choose another people, while Israel rebels against him.  
 Hos 4.4: *כְּמִרְיָ כֹהֵן* (= כַּכֹּהֲנִים מְרִיבִים; cf. above § 12 ff.): *like fighting priests*; cf. Job 3.5: *כְּמִרְיָ יוֹם*: *black days*.  
 Hos 5.5: *וְעָנָה גְּאוֹן יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּפָנָיו*: *And He will crush Israel's pride in His wrath* (or: *anguish*); cf. Ruth 1.21: *וַיְהִי עָנָה בִּי* and 1 Sam 1.18: *וּפָנֶיהָ לֹא הָיוּ לָהּ עוֹד*.  
 Hos 5.9: *בְּשִׁבְטִי יִשְׂרָאֵל הוֹדַעְתִּי נֶאֱמָנָה*: *With My rod I taught Israel surely* (or: *truly*); cf. 4.14: *בְּשִׁבְטִי יִכּוּ עַל הַלְחִי*, and Judg 8.16: *וַיִּדְעוּ בָהֶם*.  
 Hos 11.11: *וְהוֹשַׁבְתִּים*: from *יֵשֵׁב* = *שוב* (cf. HG § 64): *And I will bring them back to their houses*.

Hos 12.7: תָּשׁוּב (וְאַתָּה בְּאֱלֹהֶיךָ): *And in thy God shalt thou find rest*; cf. Isa 30.15: בְּשׁוּבָה וְנַחַת.

Hos 13.15: יִפְרִיא: denominative verb, from פָּרָא: *to run wild about*.

Hos 14.8: יִשְׁבּוּ // יִשְׁבִּי is a doublet (cf. BE § 66;) on the interchange between ו and י, cf. HPT § 30); vocalize: יִשְׁבוּ; cf. following יִחִיו.

Joel 1.7: וְהִשְׁלִיךְ: denominative verb, from Isa 6.13: שְׁלָכָה: *and hath cast down its leaves*.

Joel 1.8: "...like a virgin... for the husband...". The comparison is: the virgin never had a husband, and so the עֵץ and תְּאֵנָה had no fruit, either; cf. v. 11: חֹטֵא וְעַל: שְׁעָרָה, implying: *for the absence of חֹטֵא and שְׁעָרָה*.

Joel 1.12: (גַּם תִּמָּר וְתִפּוּחַ): רִמּוֹן: perhaps: רִמּוֹ: *even the palm-tree and apple-tree deceived*; cf. Hos 9.2: וְתִירוֹשׁ יִכְחַשׁ בָּהּ; Hab 3.17: בְּחַשׁ מַעֲשֵׂה זֵית.

Joel 2.5: בְּקוֹל מְרַכְּבוֹת: "like the noise... do they leap"; but "noise" does not "leap"; therefore: *like noisy chariots* (cf. BE § 85 on Ps 22).

Joel 4.8: לְשִׁבְיָאִים: *as captives*; plur. to שְׁבִי; cf. 1 Chron 12.9: צָבִי, plur. to וְכִצְבָּאִים.

Amos 2.14: יֹאמֵץ (לֹא); vocalize: יֹאמֵץ: *And the strong, his might shall not be powerful*; cf. v. 16: וְאִמִּין לָבוּ בְּגִבּוֹרִים; עָרוֹם יָנוּס בְּיוֹם הַהוּא.

Amos 4.2: (נִשְׁבַּע אֲדֹנִי יְהוָה) בְּקֹדְשׁוֹ: *The Lord God hath sworn in His sanctuary* (scil. His dwelling-place; cf. Hab 2.20: וַיְהוֹה; Ps 60.8: בְּקֹדְשׁוֹ; cf. also in Jonah 2.5: נִגְרַשְׁתִּי מִנֶּגֶד עֵינֶיךָ; אֵךְ אוֹסִיף לְהַבִּיט אֶל הַיָּם קֹדֶשְׁךָ).

Amos 5.16: אֲדָנִי (אֱלֹהֵי צְבָאוֹת) // יְהוָה is a doublet (cf. BE § 71 under 6 and 8).



Amos 6.10: וּמִסְפָּדוֹ (דודו); perhaps: וּמִסְפָּדוֹ (or: pi'el): *his friend and mourner*. Cf. Jer 16.6: לֹא יִקְבְּרוּ וְלֹא יִסְפְּדוּ לָהֶם; also ib. 22.18/19: סִפֵּד is almost regularly found in connection with death and burial. On the interchange between ר and ד, cf. HPT § 21.

Amos 6.12: הֲיִקְצְרוּן סֵלַע בְּסוּסִים; perhaps: הֲיִקְצְרוּן בְּסוּסִים: *Does one reap rocks with horses, or plow (them) with oxen?* On the construction of the בִּי (appended to סֵלַע, while referring to סוּסִים), cf. on Prov 31.13.

Obad 7: לֶחֱמֶךָ; vocalize: לֶחֱמֶךָ; cf. Prov 23.1: כִּי תֵשֵׁב לֶלְחֹם: *את מושל*; translate: *They that dine with thee*.

Obad 16: וְלָעוּ (וְשָׁתוּ) (cf. Prov 23.2: בְּלִעְךָ): *They shall drink and get choked*; cf. following: וְהָיוּ בְּלֹא הָיוּ.

Jonah 1.6: נִרְדָּם is inf. (= נִרְדָּם). Similar cases of interchange between נִרְדָּם and נִרְדָּם, cf. Zeph 2.9: יִבְזוּם (= יִבְזוּם), Isa 7.11: שָׁאֲלָה (= שָׁאֲלָה), Nah 1.2: קָנוּא (= קָנוּא).

Jonah 1.14: נֹא נֹא נֹא אֵל implies that Jonah was guilty and they were ready to cast him into the sea; but with וְאֵל תִּתֵּן עָלֵינוּ דָם נִקִּיא they admit that they were not at all certain of Jonah's guilt but were apprehensive lest they throw an innocent man into the water. Hence עָלֵינוּ is perhaps a euphemism (תִּקּוּן סוּפְרִים) for עָלֵינוּ, and דָם נִקִּיא referring to themselves who would otherwise perish (note the ending of the verse: כִּי אַתָּה יְהוָה כֹּאשֶׁר חִפְצָת עֲשִׂית).

Jonah 2.7: בְּרִחָיָהּ (הָאָרֶץ); perhaps: בְּרִיחָהּ: *The earth is barred unto me for ever*.

Micah 2.1: וּפְעָלֵי (רָע); plur. to פְּעָלֵי (= וּפְעָלֵי): *and acts of evil*; cf. Isa 59.6: מַעֲשֵׂה אָנוּן וּפְעָלֵי חָמָס.

Micah 2.4: יִחְלַק; denominative verb, from חָלַק (cf. in this same verse!): *he apportioned*.



Micah 2.9: מִבְּתֵי הַבָּיִת הַזֶּה: *from the houses of their delight*; namely: the houses, where they experienced delight. "Pleasant houses" reflects on the architecture or interior furnishing of the houses, but not on the personal experiences of their inhabitants.

Micah 2.10: הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה ( = הַבַּיִת ) is a noun (cf. HPH § 81β).

Micah 2.11: divide and read: שָׁרַף מִן הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה; on the expression מִן הַבַּיִת, cf. Hos 12.2: מִן הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה.

Micah 3.4: עָשׂוּ: denominative verb, from עָשָׂה: *their doings are evil*.

Micah 3.6: הַשָּׂדֶה is a noun, the fem. form to שָׂדֶה (cf. BE § 10).  
Micah 3.10: הַבַּיִת is plural (cf. HPT § 68 and note 222 there); cf. the plural in preceding v. 9: שָׂדֶה . . . עָשׂוּ.

Micah 3.11: הֵחָל: *decide* (or: *make decisions*); cf. Hag 2.11 f.

Micah 3.12: שָׂדֶה הַזֶּה: *shall be blowed into a field*; namely, by destroying the buildings. הֵחָל: "heaps", scil. of stones.

Micah 4.6: הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה: perhaps הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה, cf. Num 14.33: וְהָיָה הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה: *And I will put right* (or: *on the right way*) *those that are going astray*; cf. Isa 9.15: וְהָיָה הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה.

Micah 4.14: הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה (הַבַּיִת); probably one word: הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה; nominal formation with prefix הַבַּיִת to הַבַּיִת; cf. Ezek 27.6: הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה, which according to the Targum, is one word, too: הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה.

Micah 5.7: הַבַּיִת (הַבַּיִת): *Who, if he be enraged*; cf. Micah 5.7.  
Micah 7.3: הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה: *it is not too darling*, if it is not too darling, I would suggest: הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה: *To do evil* or *act kindly*, ransom *asketh the prince*; cf. Amos 5.12: הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה: *Jer 10.5: הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה: הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה*.

Nah 3.17: כְּנוֹב גּוֹכִי is one word: a noun formed by reduplication (cf. BE § 83 on Micah 7.11). On the absolute form of the plur. ending in יָ, cf. § 9.

Hab 1.3: תְּבִיט has here causative meaning: *And lettest me behold*; cf. the parallel תִּרְאֵנִי: "dost Thou show me." Similarly, Zech 3.9: וּמִשְׁתִּי has transitive, ib. 14.4: וּמִשׁ intransitive meaning; Isa 28.19: הִבִּין (שְׁמוּעָה): "to understand", but ib. v. 9: יִבִּין (שְׁמוּעָה): "shall one make to understand" (causative).

Hab 1.4: לִנְצַח: *victorious*; cf. on Ps 13.2.

מִכְתִּיר: denominative verb, from כָּתַר or כָּתַרְתָּ: *to be the head of, superior or above of*.

Hab 2.6: וּמְלִיצָה (חִידוֹת); perhaps to read: יְמִלִיצָה (cf. the parallel יִשְׁאוּ; on the ending ה־ cf. HPT § 46): a denominative verb, from מָלַץ (cf. Prov 1.6): *Figure out riddles*.

Hab 3.8: מִרְכַּבְתֶּיךָ יְשׁוּעָה: "Thy chariots of victory" would correspond to a Hebrew text מִרְכַּבְתֶּיךָ יְשׁוּעָה, cf. Isa 59.7: מִחֲשָׁבוֹתֵיהֶם מִחֲשָׁבוֹת אֵוֶן; a noun with suffixes cannot be מִצָּי in a construct state. Therefore: *the chariots of Thy victory*.

Zeph 2.4: יִגְרְשׁוּהָ (אֲשָׁדוֹד . . .); perhaps to read: יִשְׁדוּהָ: *Ashdod, at the noonday they shall despoil her* (on the interchange ר-ד, cf. HPT § 21).

Zeph 3.20: The י in שְׁבוֹתֵיכֶם is merely *mater lectionis* (cf. HG § 34).

Zech 12.10: וְתַחֲנוּנִים (חֶן): nominal formation with prefix ת to חֶן; similarly: Ezra 9.8: תַּחֲנֶה; cf. on Micah 4.14; also Isa 29.2: תִּאֲנֶה וְאֲנֶה. Hence: *of grace and of kindness*.

Zech 13.6: מֵאֵהָבִי (בֵּית): the absolute state of the plur., cf. § 9: *in the house of love*.

Mal 3.17: הָעֶבֶד; read: הָעֶבֶר (cf. HPT §§ 21 and 23): Though Israel troubled the Lord, still, He spares them as His children. Filial duties are termed כָּבֵד and יָרָא; only God expects Israel to עֲבֹד him, cf. v. 18.

Mal 3.19: עֲשֵׂה (רְשָׁעָה) is plural; cf. preceding יָדִים. Cf. on Micah 3.10.

§ 26. Ps 13.2: נָצַח cannot mean "for ever", since verse a and b offer אָנָּה עַד "how long" as a question. Hence: *Will Thou utterly forget me*; cf. on Jer 15.18 and Hab 1.4.

Ps 23.3: נִפְשִׁי יָשׁוּבָב: *He grants rest (or: calms down) my soul*, cf. Isa 30.15: בְּשׁוּבָה וְנַחַת.

Ps 26.7: לְשִׁמְעַ בְּקוֹל תוֹדָה: *To make thanksgiving be heard with (loud) voice*; cf. on 66.8.

Ps 31.3: מְהֵרָה is an imperative, cf. preceding הֵטָה and following הֵיָה (=1 Sam 23.27: מְהֵרָה): *Make haste to deliver me*. No ל has to be added to הַצִּילֵנִי; cf. 69.18: מְהֵרָה עֲנֵנִי.

Ps 63.2: (בְּאַרְצָן צִיָּה) וְעֵינַי is a construct state; עֵינַי is a noun; cf. on Jer 2.25.

Ps 66.8: וְהִשְׁמִיעוּ קוֹל תְּהִלָּתוֹ: *And make His praise be heard with (loud) voice*; cf. on 26.7. Note also here v. 17: אָלִיו פִּי קָרָאתִי: "I cried unto Him with my mouth"; v. 19: הִקְשִׁיב בְּקוֹל תַּפְלִתִּי: "He hath attended to the voice of my prayer."

Ps. 102.25 בְּדוֹר דּוֹרִים is one word: a noun formed by reduplication; cf. on Nah. 3.17.

Ps 105.6: בְּחִירִי is sing. (cf. HPT § 80) and refers to יַעֲקֹב cf. Isa 42.1: בְּחִירִי . . . עֲבָדִי, to which Origen adds *sub obelo*: Ἰακὼβ . . . Ἰσραηλ; cf. 1 Chron 16.13, where the text actually has יַעֲקֹב בְּחִירִיו . . . עֲבָדוּ; cf. also Isa 44.1: עֲבָדִי יַעֲקֹב. Isa 45.4: יַעֲקֹב עֲבָדִי וְיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּחִירִי בִּי. Translate: *The children of Jacob, His chosen one*.



Ps 106.3: עֲשֵׂה (צִדְקָה) is parallel to שְׁמְרֵי (מִשְׁפָּט) and hence plural; cf. on Micah 3.10.

Ps 119.50: נִחַמְתִּי is an inflected form with preservation of the first vowel, cf. on Ezek 35.12.

Ps 141.3: שְׁמֶרָה is a noun (= מִשְׁמֶר); cf. on Micah 3.6 and 2.10.

Prov 1.32: מְשׁוּבָת (פְּתִיחַ) is parallel to וְשִׁלּוֹת (בְּסִילִים); hence cf. Isa 30.15: בְּשׁוּבָה וְנַחַת and translate: *carelessness*.

Prov 4.7: וּבְכָל קִנְיָן קָנָה בִּינָה; *and whensoever you acquire (anything), acquire (or: let it be) understanding*.

Prov 6.34: קִנְיָנָה is a verb (= קָנָה): *For jealous is a man's rage*.

Prov 7.19: מִרְחוֹק is a noun (= מִרְחָק); cf. also Isa 22.3: מִרְחוֹק בְּרָחוּ, where מִרְחוֹק indicates the direction, whereto they fled. Cf. on Jer 23 23.

Prov 8.6: נִגְיָדִים is a derivation of נִגַּד: *the obvious, apparent*.

Prov 20.8: מִזְרָה is a nominal form with prefix מ to זָר: *abomination*.

Prov 23.28: תּוֹסִיף; from the root יסַף=אסַף (cf. HG § 64): *gathers in or: collects*; cf. Ps 104.29: תִּסַּף רוּחָם; vice versa: Ex 5.7: תִּסַּף=אסַף (דָּא), from יסַף=אסַף.

Prov 26.17: connect: כָּלָב עֵבֶר: *a stray dog*.

Prov 26.18: כִּמְתַלְתֵּל; read: כִּמְתַּחַל; cf. v. 19: הֲלֹא מִשְׁחַק אֲנִי.

Prov 26.21: לְחַרְחַר (רִיב) is onomatopoeic, imitating the growling guttural sounds accompanying a dog-fight (חר חר).

Prov 27.19: הַפָּנִים (לְפָנִים); vocalize: הַפָּנִים: *Like water that floweth onward*.

Prov 27.26: וּמַחִיר עֲתוּדִים שָׂדֶה (= וּמַחִיר עֲתוּדִים שָׂדֶה); cf. BE § 72): *And the sale of goats is (for) a field*.

Prov 28.2: רָבִים; vocalize: רָבִים: *their princes fight*.

יָדַע // מִבֵּין is a doublet (cf. BE § 65 f.); cf. similarly Nehem 10.29: כָּל יוֹדַע מִבֵּין.

בָּנִים אֲנַחֲנוּ: *right prevails*; cf. Gen 42.11: בֵּן יֵאָרֵץ.



Prov 28.6: מַעֲשִׂיר וְהוּא עָקֹשׁ דְּרָכָיו (= מעשיר והוא עקש דרכים); cf. BE § 72): *Than the rich, who is perverse in his ways.*

Prov 29.2: בְּרָבוֹת (צַדִּיקִים): *when righteous men rule*; cf. Jer 39.13: וְכָל רַבִּי מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל with ib. v. 3: שָׂרִי.

Prov 29.10: וַיִּבְקְשׁוּ נַפְשׁוֹ וַיִּשְׁרִים (= ויבקשו נפש ישרים); cf. BE § 72): *and seek the life of the upright.*

Prov 31.13: חָפֶץ בְּכַפִּיָּה (= וְתַעֲשֶׂה) בְּחָפֶץ בְּפִיָּה; cf. 19.12: נָהֵם בַּעֲצֵי הַפִּשְׁתָּה = בְּפִשְׁתֵּי הָעֵץ; Josh 2.6: כִּנְהָם כַּפִּיר = כְּכַפִּיר Prov 5.4: (כַּפִּיּוֹת חָרַב = כְּחָרַב פִּיּוֹת): *And maketh a (choice) thing with her hands.*

Job 3.5: בְּמִרְיֵי יוֹם; cf. on Hos 4.4.

Lam 1.8: לָנֶדָה is identical in meaning with מָנוֹד (scil. ראש); cf. Ps 44.15: מִשַּׁל בְּגוֹיִם מָנוֹד רֹאשׁ בְּלֹאמִים: *shaking (of the head)*. "Unclean" here is meaningless, since the גוֹיִם did not observe the laws of "clean" and "unclean".

Lam 1.9: הִגְדִּיל is a denominative verb, from גָּדוֹל: *For the enemy is great*, cf. v. 16: כִּי גָבַר אוֹיֵב.

Ezra 2.62: כְּתָבָם הַמְתִּיחָשִׁים: *their genealogical register*. The מִצָּף (cf. HG § 71) has the suffix; cf. on Isa 31.7. Cf. also Ezra 8.1: וְהִתִּיחָשָׁם: "the genealogy of them."

Ezra 9.3: מִשְׁעֵר (רֹאשִׁי): nominal formation with prefix מ to שִׁעַר (cf. BE § 74 on Ex 12.4).

Nehem 2.16: עֲשֵׂה (וּלְיִתֵּר) (הַמְלָאכָה) is plur.; cf. on Micah 3.10.

1 Chron 4.10: וְעָשִׂיתָ מִרְעָה לְבִלְתִּי עֲצָבִי: vocalize: וְעָשִׂיתָ מִרְעָה לְבִלְתִּי עֲצָבִי: *then I shall do (or: act) evil toward Belthi my idol*; מִרְעָה is a nominal form with prefix מ to רָעָה; cf. on Ezra 9.3. On the vocalization of עֲצָבִי (with עָ), cf. BE § 11.

## HABIRU — 'IBHRIM\*

By E. TAEUBLER

The designation *habiru* is usually explained either from the Accadian permansive 'abir "one who is passing, transient, nomad", or from the participle 'ābir > Hebr. 'ōber "one who crosses". On the basis of the Nuzi documents mentioning *habiru*-slaves both derivations lead to the highly erroneous opinion that *habiru*, that started out as an appellative, originally meant either foreigners in general or, specifically, foreigners in the status of temporary slavery. But apart from the weakness of the historical conclusions as to the later Hebrews, the linguistic basis has been proved wrong. I myself take an entirely different course, going back, as Hans Bauer did in his Historical Grammar, to the noun עֶבֶר, Accadian <'ibr, <'abir, τὸ πέραν, the opposite side. That the form qitl 'ibr may go back to an older qatil 'abir, is recognized (Speiser), and the denominative-ending '— being unknown in Accadian, the ethnic form עֶבְרִי corresponds to the Accadian appellative 'abiru, *habiru*.

As is well known, עֶבֶר assumed in Hebrew the simple meaning of "side"; to quote only two passages, I Kings 5:4 מִכָּל-עֶבְרָיו מִסְבִּיב, ἐκ πάντων τῶν μερῶν κυκλόθεν, and Jer. 49:32 מִכָּל-עֶבְרָיו corresponding to v. 5 מִכָּל-סְבִיבָּיִךְ. Most striking is I Sam. 14:4: שֵׁן הַסֶּלַע מֵהָעֵבֶר מִזֶּה וְשֵׁן הַסֶּלַע מֵהָעֵבֶר מִזֶּה 'a cliff of rock on either side.'

The same meaning occurs, in a still more characteristic manner, in some Assyrian and South Arabic texts. Starting from these passages I intend to demonstrate that *habiru* means "those

\*Short excerpt from Studies on Hebrew Origins that I have not yet the opportunity to publish.

at the side, or sides, of the river", of course of the middle Euphrates. I shall begin with the interpretation of two famous biblical passages.

I Sam. 31:7 **וַיֵּרְאוּ אֲנָשֵׁי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר-בְּעֶבֶר הָעֵמֶק וְאֲשֶׁר בְּעֶבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן בֵּינְסוּ אֲנָשֵׁי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְכִי־מָתוּ שָׂאוֹל וּבָנָיו וַיַּעֲזְבוּ אֶת־הָעָרִים וַיֵּנָסוּ וַיָּבֹאוּ פְּלִשְׁתִּים וַיֵּשְׁבוּ בָּהֶן:**

Already the Chronicler (I 10:7) recognized that it was impossible to think of the other side of the Jordan and an opposite side of the Emeq. He, therefore, replaced both local designations by a simple **בְּעֵמֶק** what clearly shows that he understood also **עֶבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן** of the western side of the river, while modern interpreters change **בְּעֶבֶר** to **בְּעָרִי**. We are prepared to understand the passage thus: the Israelites who fled did so, as is obvious, from the cities at the northern side (**עֶבֶר**) of the Emeq and the western side of the Jordan.

The second passage is Is. 8:23 **בָּעֵת הָרִאשׁוֹן הִקְלָ אֶרְצָה וּבְלוֹן וְאֶרְצָה נִפְתָּלִי וְהָאֲחֵרוֹן הַכְּבִיד דָּרָךְ הֵימָּן עֶבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן גְּלִיל הַגּוֹזִים:**

Even such keen critics as Bernhard Duhm and Ed. Meyer understood **עֶבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן** as referring to Gilead, although the context can not leave the slightest doubt that it is to be understood as designating the western side of the river, not only because of the parallelism in which it stands, together with **דָּרָךְ הֵימָּן**, to Zebulun and Naphtali, but also because of the position of **הַיַּרְדֵּן** between **הֵימָּן** and **גְּלִיל הַגּוֹזִים**, this latter comprising **אֶרְצָה נִפְתָּלִי** and **אֶרְצָה וּבְלוֹן** as well as **עֶבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן** and **דָּרָךְ הֵימָּן**.

My second argument comes from Asia Minor. It is given by some passages in a treaty concluded between the Hittite king Shubbiluliuma and the Mitanni king Mattiuaza, written in Accadian. In these passages the designation *eburu* or *ebirtu* has acquired the simple meaning of "bank (of a river)", as is evident from the addition of *annitu* "this" and *ullitu*, "the other": *matati ša e-bi-ir-ti an-ni-ti* and *a-na e-bi-ir-ti nar Puratti ul-li-ti*.



The third argument comes from South Arabia. Ernst Weidner, in his edition of the aforementioned treaty, pointed to a remark which Hugo Winckler, in 1905, had made with reference to a Sabeian inscription. I quote, in translation: "In Sabeian, as is well known, 'br designates the soil which borders directly upon the river on either side".

Afterwards I found a yet earlier remark of Winckler, that in the Minean language 'abar nahran does not mean the other side of a river but generally the land by the river, and in that connection already Winckler had asked whether the explanation of the name עֲבָרִים as *eber-men*, that means as inhabitants of the river-area, would not yield a better meaning than "those from the other side of the river".

Winckler had made this remark in connection with his curious Musri-theory. Maybe this was the reason that it remained ineffective and even unnoticed.

I return to my own observations pointing now first to an analogy. This example comes from the banks of the Rhine: the German tribe of the *Franci Ripuarii*, Riverside Franks. This is only an analogy. But now may follow an example which leads us back to the Euphrates and is more than only an analogy. It goes directly back to the designation *habiru* and is identical with it: the name (Aram) Naharaim, riverland. The designation of the people was used to form after it the name of the area of their settlement. The Greek translators rendered this designation by Μεσοποταμία, the land between the rivers Euphrates and Tigris, but it has long been recognized that that was a mistake and the rendering ought rather to be Παρὰ ποταμία, the land at the river. A comparison is possible with the Παρὰ ποταμίοι in Phokis at the river Kephisos, and with the Παράλιοι in Attica. The Hebrew Naharaim appears as *matu nahrima* in the Amarna-tablets, and in Egyptian inscriptions as Naharin. The ending -*ajim*, -*ajin* is not, as it is taken to be in the Septuagint, a dual,



but, as Jacob Barth has shown, a locat ve. This name occurs first in Egyptian inscriptions of the time of the New Empire, and in these as well as in the Amarna letters it is extended to designate the whole Mitanni country, a well known phenomenon of the extension of a border-name: so the Γραικοί, the Itali, Allemagne a. o. It was evidently taken over by the Egyptians from the Canaanites and Amorites.

I am at the end. All the occupations with which we find Hebrews in other countries — in Babylonia, in Assyria, in Asia minor, in Syria, not to speak here also of Egypt — are, of course, compatible with what I tried to demonstrate as their origin. The local character of the designation made it possible that it was not bound to one tribe alone, but could be adopted by, or applied to, any tribe settling there. Whether, and at what time, and to what extent these riverside half-nomads felt themselves, or were considered to be, an ethnical group, will always remain an unanswered question.

I might only still add that the identification of Naharaim as name of the country with *habiru* as name of the people was the starting point for me, more than twenty years ago, on the basis of the interpretation of the two biblical passages. Only after I had later found the passages in the Hittite treaty, I became sure of my opinion. Finally, only when preparing this essay, I became aware of the older remarks made by Winckler.

## THE HEBREW OF THE GENIZA SIRACH

By CHARLES C. TORREY

The fragments of the Proverbs of Ben Sira which were found, half a century ago, in the rubbish from the *geniza* of a synagogue in Cairo have raised many questions, some of which still await a satisfying answer.

The Hebrew of the fragments has aroused especial interest from the first, and with good reason, for it is unique. There is no Hebrew like it in the Bible, nor — as far as the available evidence can show — in the post-Biblical literature. It is a curious linguistic mixture, the fruit of a perplexing history. The following brief essay is an attempt to gain some new ground in this difficult study.

The discovery, in 1896, of a Hebrew text of a portion of the Sirach proverbs made a great sensation; it seemed a veritable resurrection. The portion of the text which first came to light was a small fraction of the whole, amounting to about ten chapters of the original fifty-one. It was given excellent publication by A. E. Cowley and Ad. Neubauer, *The Original Hebrew of a Portion of Ecclesiasticus* (39:15–49:11), Oxford, 1897. This publication, in the sequel referred to as *Edition A*, contained also the ancient versions and an English translation, as well as the quotations from Ben Sira in Rabbinical literature.

In the meantime other portions of the text, found in the same place, were coming to light; so that eventually there was published, in 1899, a volume containing about thirty-six chapters. This was the publication *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, by S. Schechter and C. Taylor, Cambridge; referred to in the sequel as *Edition B*.

Another small portion of the text — needing no further mention here — was soon after discovered in the *débris* from the Genizah.

The leaves which were found came from two different manuscripts of the book. One of these, represented by only four

leaves, was written somewhat closely, and with less care; the other, a fine specimen of calligraphy in an eleventh century hand, was written in lines divided into hemistichs but "very variable in length, and without any indication that the author sought to adapt them to a uniform metrical scheme."<sup>1</sup> There are numerous marginal readings showing very considerable variation; and a few Persian glosses seem to make it evident whence the manuscripts came, though not necessarily where they were written.

It was generally taken for granted, from the first, that the newly found Hebrew was a genuine survival from the original. The only objection which at the time seemed to call for especial notice was D. S. Margoliouth's *The Origin of the 'Original Hebrew' of Ecclesiasticus*, Oxford, 1899. This attempted to show that the Genizah text is a translation, partly from the Syriac and partly from a Persian version made from the Greek. Taylor undertook to refute this in *Edition B*, pages LXX-LXXV, and it ceased to receive notice, though a part of its argument was not satisfactorily answered.

Thus Israel Lévi could write in the *Jewish Encyclopedia* (1899), in speaking of the Genizah fragments: "It may safely be said that in the main the work of Ben Sira has been preserved just as it left his hands."<sup>2</sup>

The existing versions, especially the Greek and the Syriac, were indeed eagerly consulted. The former of these, in particular, might be expected to mirror the precise form of words written down by the great moralist himself. Ben Sira's grandson, as is well known, moved to Egypt in the year 132 B. C. E., found there a copy of his grandfather's proverbs, and translated them into Greek. In a brief prologue to his translation he tells the reader how it came about that he undertook this task and how he conceived it. Therefore it seemed necessary, first of all, to compare the newly found Hebrew with the grandson's Greek.

<sup>1</sup> Edition A, page XIV.

<sup>2</sup> This he retracted in the following year; and in the second volume (1901) of his *L'Ecclésiastique ou la Sagesse de Jesus fils de Sira* he proved conclusively that Ben Sira's acrostic poem in Chap. 51 is a translation from the Syriac. (It was not made clear why the translation should have been confined to this one portion of the book!)



The two texts were found to agree extensively in material content, and yet there were very great and important differences. The Greek could not have been obtained from any Hebrew resembling this, nor could the Hebrew possibly have been derived from the Greek. The two traditions were perfectly distinct; which had the better claim to represent the original Sirach?

The question had already been answered, to the satisfaction of the experts in Old Testament science. I quote first the words of Theodor Nöldeke, the foremost Semitic scholar of his time, in an article which he contributed to the English journal, *The Expositor*, in the number for May, 1897, pages 347 ff.:

"When the first news came of the discovery of a Hebrew fragment of the Book of Sirach, it occurred doubtless to many others as well as to myself to suppose that it was only some mediaeval re-translation, possibly from a Latin text. But as soon as the fragment brought to Cambridge by Mrs. Lewis appeared in the *Expositor* (vol. IV. [1896], pp. 6 ff.) no competent judge could any longer doubt that we had a portion of the original before us. This resulted at once from its relation to the two direct translations which have long been known, the Greek and the Syriac. These are related to the Hebrew text as two mutually independent translations. The Hebrew is reproduced with greater accuracy now by one and now by the other, and cannot be derived directly or indirectly from either of them. Moreover, the language throughout gives the impression of an original. It is hardly to be conceived that Hebrew such as this could be written by any one at the close of the classical period or in the Middle ages. The genuineness of the fragment is now brilliantly confirmed by the larger portion which has since come to light, and been brought to Oxford by Prof. Sayce . . . Among all the rich documentary discoveries of our time this one claims a foremost rank. In the field of the Old Testament nothing like it has happened before."

Nöldeke had seen but the first small installment of the Genizah text, and it was a thrilling sight. Here was the wisdom of Ben Sira, the same long-familiar proverbs, in a classical-sounding Hebrew which, as examination showed, could not have been



derived from either or both of the two important versions, the Greek and the Syriac. There seemed to be but one reasonable verdict, the Hebrew from the Cairo Genizah must be—somehow—a survival from the original text.

Professor Schechter, in his original publication of the leaf first discovered, had expressed himself similarly, saying of the Hebrew text: "Its correspondence with the versions changes almost in every line, agreeing in some places with the Greek, in others with the Syriac. In other places, again, it agrees with *neither* of these versions, omitting whole clauses which are to be found both in the Greek and in the Syriac, or offering new readings which have been either misunderstood or misread by the translators. Certain clauses, again, are to be found in our manuscript which are wanting in *both* versions, or are only reproduced by a very short paraphrase. There cannot, therefore, be even the shadow of a doubt that our text represents nothing else but the original."

At the time when Schechter wrote the words just quoted there had appeared no reason to doubt that *Heb* and *Grk*<sup>3</sup> were related to each other, generally speaking, in the same way that any Hebrew book of the Bible is related to its Greek version, the frequent lack of agreement being due to mistakes of interpretation and to the inevitable errors of manuscript transmission. The fact, however, proved to be quite otherwise.

When all the material was at hand for comparison, and the Hebrew was confronted with the Greek, every prediction was at once put to shame. It is not simply that the Greek and the Hebrew do not correspond closely, in some such way as text and version correspond in every other Old Testament writing of which the original has been preserved; *the two are thoroughly diverse from each other in every part of the book*. Generally speaking, the material is the same and in the same order. A given verse of a given chapter in *Heb* will usually be found to have some recognizable counterpart in the similarly numbered verse in *Grk*. When however we look for verbal agreement we rarely

<sup>3</sup> In the sequel, *Heb* will be the symbol of the Cairo Hebrew, and *Grk* that of the grandson's Greek version.

find it, even in those very numerous passages in which the Greek seems to show us with certainty not only the idiom but also the exact words employed by Ben Sira. If we suppose that this translation was made in the manner of the other Greek versions of which we have knowledge, we are obliged to conclude that it was made from another Hebrew text. There are not half a dozen consecutive verses in our Greek, in any part of the whole book, which could possibly have been derived by translation from the Cairo Hebrew or from any Hebrew closely resembling it.

Now this is a condition of things which has no parallel, nor even a remote likeness, in the history either of ancient translations or of ancient manuscript transmission. There is a strange problem here, and the true solution has not been found.

It has been customary to accuse the grandson of making a loose translation, and to question the authority of the Hebrew text which he used. As for the latter consideration, it is only necessary to read the preface which he wrote, and to bear in mind that no great amount of time had elapsed since the book was published. There could be no reason for supposing noteworthy alteration of the text; and we can be sure that the proud grandson of Ben Sira would have taken pains to select the best available manuscript, if there was a choice. The Hebrew which he rendered has the presumption in its favor, in comparison with any other.

The question regarding the nature of the translation would seem to be easy of answer. We are well provided with examples of rendering from Hebrew into Greek, and know in general what to expect. Moreover, the translator tells us, in his preface, that he appreciated the difficulties attending such work of translating "from the original language into another tongue," and that he has bestowed great care and much labor on the task. We are therefore prepared at the outset to find the rendering truly faithful, according to its author's ability.

This is not a new inquiry, and the answer has been given repeatedly by competent scholars. It will be well to quote from O. F. Fritzsche's introduction to his Commentary, *Die Weisheit Jesus-Sirachs*, Leipzig, 1860, Einleitung, S. XXII (rendered into

English): "The Greek is a very close, often slavishly exact, rendering. The translator was sufficiently acquainted with the Greek language of the *Koiné* type, possessed a good vocabulary, was familiar with the grammatical forms, and could think in Greek; the reason why he nevertheless produced a work faulty in its language and sometimes flatly incomprehensible is this, that his translation was anxiously word-for-word, and that even in those cases where he was unable to give the meaning of his original — whether because it had suffered corruption or because his knowledge of Hebrew was insufficient — he held fast to the text before him, reproducing faithfully both what he understood and what he did not understand."

This characterization by Fritzsche is only what commentators and students of the book have been wont to say, and to illustrate. The Grandson's version is typical "translation-Greek," similar in all respects to the other Alexandrian translations of Biblical books. The close correspondence between version and original has been demonstrated in a multitude of cases in the Greek Sirach, and it has seemed as possible here as in any of the renderings of the so-called Septuagint to restore the words and idioms of Ben Sira's Hebrew.

A different opinion has been expressed in recent years, namely, since the discovery of the Genizah Sirach. In R. H. Charles' great corpus of the O. T. apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, *Ecclesiasticus* is taken in charge by Canon Box and Dr. Oesterley, and extensive use is made of the newly-found Hebrew. Dr. Oesterley writes as follows (Introduction, §4, page 280) about the Siracide's Greek version: "Ben Sira's grandson clearly does not consider it the duty of a translator to give anything in the shape of a literal translation of his original; he seeks, rightfully, to present as far as possible a well-constructed Greek interpretation rather than a slavish reproduction of what he translates."

This is pure theory, supported by no fact other than the thorough disagreement of *Heb* with *Grk*. We have no particle of evidence of any such mode of translation, in the Old Testament or the apocryphal books or the New Testament; on the contrary, we know the then existing conception of the translator's duty, which was to render *words*, not ideas. No paraphrasing version



is known, or would have been possible. More than this, an examination of any given part of the book shows conclusively a slavishly literal mode of rendering.

The feeling was strong, however, and seemingly justified, that "a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush," the bush in this case being the Greek and Syriac versions; but some birds are less valuable than others.

The literary estimate of Ben Sira's proverbs, in the days when our knowledge of the book was derived from the Greek, was always high. The German scholar Cornill, in his introduction to the O. T. (1896), calls the book "the crown of the apocrypha, one of the finest specimens of Israelite literature." We get inevitably from the Greek an impression of native force and originality, of the writing of a master who knew what he wished to say, and who said it clearly and concisely. Whoever reads these wise and pungent sayings, even in their often awkward and faulty Greek dress or in modern translations made from the Greek, feels himself in the presence of a great author.

So we have been wont to say, but the Hebrew fragments have brought with them a new atmosphere. It is now customary to apologize for the sage's shortcomings as a writer, rather than to admire him.

The style of *Heb* is very poor indeed. The words are neither well chosen nor effectively arranged. There is a great amount of weak repetition, a phrase employed in the first half of the verse being used over again, with no apparent good reason, in the second half, or in the verse next following. Logical sequence is often wanting where it is most needed.

It seems that Ben Sira was inordinately fond of employing, in season and out of season, phrases and passages from the Bible. This indeed has been pronounced his chief characteristic as a writer. Taylor remarks, in the preface to *Ed. B*, Page VII: "In diction as in thought our author is a sedulous imitator of the Hebrew Scriptures. The words which he uses are not all his own, his work being more or less a tissue of old classical phrases, like a modern school composition in a dead language."

Professor Schechter, in the same volume, page 34, declares Ben Sira "a conscious imitator," and shows that the "classical"



appearance of portions of his work is deceptive, for it is "due to his skillful manipulating of Biblical passages and patching them together." On pages 13-25 Schechter gives a list of 367 quotations and reminiscences of Scripture passages. He distinguishes "verbal" and "adaptive" quotations; another classification might well be the *apposite* and the *inapposite*, for there are very many of the latter variety. He adds (*ibid.*), that Ben Sira's composition "shows already such traces of an artificial way of interpreting and using the contents of the Scriptures as are only found in post-Biblical writers."

Now this wallowing in Biblical verses and phrases was not at all characteristic of Sirach's time. In the book of Tobit, for instance, there are three rather long passages made up of pious maxims quite in the manner of Sirach's proverbs, some forty verses: 4:5-19; 12:6-11; and 13:1-18; the Hebrew Bible is hardly quoted at all. Still later, in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, many chapters of ethical teaching, the same thing is true, the writer has originality enough to give his own advice. There is plenty of other illustration.

This characterization of the supposed Ben Sira by Schechter and Taylor does not (thus far) point to a degenerate age; it merely points to a writer whose work shows poverty of ideas, no firmly held principles of literary composition, and decided lack of taste; in short, miserable incompetence.

It was of course observed by Professor Taylor and the subsequent editors and commentators that the literary defects above mentioned — foolish repetition, incoherence, misuse of Scripture, etc. — are not present in the Greek version; but the fact aroused little interest. It was accounted for in the way already mentioned (see the quotation from Oesterley, above): the Siracide, it was said, whose native tongue was Greek, gave the proverbs an acceptable literary dress, smoothing over and correcting what had been faulty in the Hebrew. How can we explain the almost total absence of the "367 Biblical phrases and quotations" which are such a conspicuous part of *Ileb*? The answer has been readily given: Ben Sira was thoroughly familiar with the Hebrew sacred writings; his grandson was not, and therefore not only failed to see the allusions to the Bible but also failed to translate them.(!)

This explanation says, in effect, that the grandson was possessed of better literary taste than the grandfather; and that he had the habit of leaving out, in his translation, what he did not understand. The former supposition is most improbable, and the latter is disproved by the large number of passages in which the translator was completely floored by the Hebrew, but rendered its *words* with desperate faithfulness.

This matter of *blind translation* is so important, and so strangely overlooked by those who pronounce our *Grk* a paraphrase, that it may be well to dwell upon it for a moment.

Every commentator on Ben Sira's book calls attention to certain words and phrases in the Greek which show that the anxious Siracide was willing to write down arrant nonsense, if it seemed to be demanded by his grandfather's Hebrew; that is, if it was the only way of mirroring faithfully the words which he saw before him. Such cases are of the utmost value when they show — as they usually do — just what the grandfather wrote. Many less conspicuous mistranslations have been noted by one commentator or another. Some of these are readily explained, and the original Hebrew has been convincingly demonstrated; the number of such witnesses would have been greater if the nature of these Greek renderings of Semitic texts were better understood at the present day.

The thing of importance which will emerge, however, is the fact that the Genizah Hebrew is thoroughly different from the Hebrew of Ben Sira. Wherever the test is made, the result is the same.

A good example is the "blind translation" in 6:2: "Be not exalted in your own persuasion, lest your soul be torn in pieces like a bull; you will consume your own foliage and destroy your fruit and will leave yourself like a dry stem."

Evidently that which is "torn off," so that its leaves are consumed and its fruit is destroyed is a *branch* (שֹׁךְ), not a *bull* (שׁוֹר), as the Greek has it. (Observe that *Syr* renders ὡς ταῦρος, a good example of its dependence on *Grk*.)

Another specimen is 38:11, the advice to the worshipper: "Make your offering generous, as though you did not exist." *Grk*'s ὡς μὴ ὑπάρχω is here the rendering of כְּאִינִי; cf. Jer.

50:20 (Gr. 27:20) and Ps. 102:16 (Heb. 103:16). The original reading was obviously כְּאִוְנְךָ, "according to your ability." (*Heb* gives the command the conclusion which is obviously necessary, and employs a late idiom.)

A case of (corrupt) transliteration will serve equally well to show that *Heb* does not give us the true text of Sirach. According to 48:17, King Hezekiah in order to benefit Jerusalem brought in *Gog*. That which he actually brought in, according to 2 Chron. 32:30, was the water of Gihon, גִּיחוֹן, thus written by Sirach, and by his grandson transliterated Γῶν, which in careless copying became Γῶγ, with a confusion of the two letters not uncommon in cursive Greek.

This was my own conjecture before seeing that Fritzsche had made it in his Commentary. The more recent German scholars have dealt strangely with this material. Smend has a surprising note in his Commentary: "Gr. sinnlos [!]: καὶ ὠκοδόμησεν κρήνας εἰς ὕδατα." But Ben Sira's Hebrew was וַיִּבֶן לַמַּיִם בְּרִכּוֹת, "and he constructed pools for the water," which is precisely what Hezekiah did, 2 Chron. 32:3-5, 30; the former passage understood to include the making of an eastern pool between the two walls. Smend possibly was unaware that the term κρήνη was applied to the "pools" from the Gihon spring. The grandson's translation-Greek was quite correct. Here also, as so often elsewhere, in place of the interesting text which Ben Sira wrote we have in *Heb* a poor substitute.

At the very beginning of the new Hebrew text, notice is served that it is *not* the original. The first Genizah fragment begins with the closing words of 3:6, a verse dealing with the son who honors his father. *Heb* has only the closing words, "honors his mother." Grk, however, has ἀναπαύσει μητέρα αὐτοῦ, showing that Sirach wrote וַיָּנִיחַ אִמּוֹ, "will bring peace to his mother," cf. Prov. 29:17.

Verse 7 is missing. Verse 8 is spoiled by the weak citation of Deut. 28:2 in place of Ben Sira's most fitting conclusion. Observe also that the latter makes the connection with the following verse which is lost in *Heb*. The original figure of building in verse 9 is changed to planting in *Heb*. The five-fold repetition of כִּבְדַּךְ in the Hebrew of verses 10-12 can hardly be charged to Ben Sira,



and no one of these three verses as they appear in *Ileb* can stand comparison with the text which *Grk* represents.

Thenceforward, verse by verse, through the whole book, there is the same story. *Ileb* is a very inferior text, and this not only in material content but also in diction.

It was said at the beginning of this investigation that the language of our Genizah fragments is unique. It is indeed a curious mixture, such as could hardly be found elsewhere, of the classical Hebrew with the medieval. The following quotations from Professor Schechter in *Edition B* will give illustration.

After presenting on page 33 a list of the purely Rabbinic terms and phrases found in *Ileb*, Schechter sums up as follows on page 34: "These specimens are enough to show that in the times of Ben Sira the New-Hebrew dialect had long advanced beyond the transitory stage known to us from the later Biblical books, and had also reached, both in respect of grammar and of phraseology, that degree of development to which the Mishnah bears testimony."

And below, on the same page: We see that "his composition shows already such traces of an artificial way of interpreting and using the contents of the Scriptures as are only to be found in post-Biblical writers. With all his skill and caution his language is full of later Hebrew expressions, even furnishing us with criteria pointing to the highest development of the Rabbinic dialect." Page 33: "Great as his acquaintance with the Scriptures was, and strained as his efforts were in imitating them, he failed in the end."

(And this is our great author and teacher!)

On pages 26 f. Schechter deals with two classes of Biblical quotations, and then proceeds to say concerning both classes that "the most noteworthy feature is the artificial or Paitanic tendency betrayed by them. It consists in borrowing a number of ready-made expressions and phrases from the Scriptures, hereby already exhibiting that mosaic style *which is characteristic of the later post-Talmudical authors.*"<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> This clause was not italicized in the original text.



Schechter gives sixteen examples, "taken at random from all over our texts," and says that their number might easily be doubled and trebled. He remarks further, that "this Paitanic fashion can also be detected in various allusive adjectives and terms which form such a prominent feature in the later literature of the Synagogue." And again: There occur here in Sirach "a number, however small, of forms and expressions to be found only in the Paitanic literature."

That is, the language of *Heb* is *Paitanic throughout*. This character, moreover, does not appear as a new thing, but is obviously an old story. The lists of examples which are given should be studied, there is no space for them here. No scholar could have been better able to recognize and describe them than Professor Schechter. They show plainly that the "ready-made" allusions and fanciful plays on Scripture phrases, which appear in every part of the book, were familiar to those who read the proverbs in the Genizah text.

This should make it clear, once for all, that the Hebrew of the Cairo fragments was not written by Ben Sira. Does anyone who is familiar with the modern critical study of the later Biblical books and their language suppose that such Hebrew as Schechter describes could have been in general use in Jerusalem in the year 200 B. C. E.? 200 C. E. would be too early for it! Schechter remarks (*ibid.*): "Now none of the canonical writings ever shows the least sign of conscious imitation; no trace of Paitanic artificiality is to be detected in any of them." Certainly not. Numerous portions of the Prophets and of the Writings are demonstrably late; many of The Psalms were composed toward the end of the third century, perhaps no one of them as late as the boyhood of Sirach, yet all unquestionably written in the same variety of the classical tongue which he and his learned contemporaries wrote. No one of them makes in the least the impression of "a modern school composition in a dead language;" they are all fresh and living, and each of them has its own measure of originality.

The Hebrew part of Daniel was written later than Sirach's proverbs, but the language is rich, vigorous, and individual,

as far removed as possible from anything like stereotyped classicism.<sup>5</sup>

It has been shown abundantly, in the preceding pages, that the best existing testimony — almost the only trustworthy testimony — to the true form of Sirach's great work is the version made by his grandson. Here, we know what we are dealing with; indeed, we are uniquely informed. What information have we, or can we obtain, concerning the origin and history of the medieval hodge-podge which has masqueraded as the work of Jesus Ben Sira? The fact was emphasized, above, that no process of manuscript transmission could possibly have produced the result which lies before us, or anything closely resembling it, from the Hebrew which the Siracide so faithfully translated.

There is one important incident in the history of Jewish literature which has not hitherto been taken into account, in discussions of the Genizah text. We know that the reading of Ben Sira's work was prohibited, and the Hebrew text of the proverbs presumably destroyed, by official order, at some time near the end of the first century C. E. We also learn from the testimony of Rabbi Joseph bar Hiyya, a learned Babylonian scholar of the early fourth century, that the prohibition was still effective in his day, and that it had been instituted by Rabbi Akiba and his associates.<sup>6</sup>

Rabbi Joseph says nothing about the reason for the prohibition, but only deplores the loss to Israel in the banning of this fine book. Evidently the edict of the authorities had been obeyed, and *the proverbs of Ben Sira were not in circulation among the Jews*. The Rabbi's words, taken in connection with other circumstances, make it plain that the ban was not aimed especially at Ben Sira's book, but at the class of writings to which it belonged. It was, and could only have been, a single incident in a general purge of Jewish literature.

<sup>5</sup> In this connection the fact must not be overlooked that the Genizah Sirach is plainly dependent on the Hebrew of Daniel. Compare 36:10 (verse 8 in Syr) with Dan. 8:19; 11:27, 35.

<sup>6</sup> See Louis Ginzberg in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 41 (1922), P. 129; also my *Documents of the Primitive Church*, P. 109.

The conjectured course of events is set forth briefly in my *Apocryphal Literature*, pages 14, 15, 17. Overwhelmed and humbled by the catastrophe of the year 70, the Jews reproached themselves for having permitted mere human writings to take their attention away from those which had been divinely given. In the Torah, they said, is the one great fountain of life; the study of the Torah is, and will remain, the all-important business of Israel. Hold to the sacred Scriptures, and let the others perish!

It was then that Rabbi Akiba uttered his stern warning: "Among those who have no part in the world to come is he who reads in the outside books."<sup>7</sup> It was at that time also that *all* of the literature just mentioned, the extra-canonical writings in Hebrew or Aramaic, disappeared absolutely and finally. The language of the Jews was still Aramaic, and that not merely in Palestine; Hebrew was everywhere understood; such books as Tobit, Judith, Fourth Ezra, First Maccabees, and the Testaments of the Twelve, could have continued to be admirable household reading; but no trace of any of these in their original language survived.

The one and only satisfactory explanation — supported, as it is, by every known fact — is that all the extra-canonical scriptures existing in either Aramaic or Hebrew were systematically destroyed, by official Jewish order, near the end of the first century C. E. Akiba and his fellows took no half-measures in calling the people back to their holy books.

A contributory cause of the decision may well have been the appearance of heretical (Nazarene) scriptures in the one or the other of the two sacred languages (Hebrew and Aramaic). According to the accepted doctrine, the era of "*prophecy*," that is, of divinely inspired Scripture, came to an end in the Persian period. At that time, it was understood, the Holy Spirit departed temporarily from Israel, but would return in the Messianic time; and then, once more, there would be prophets and prophecy.

The Nazarenes claimed that Jesus was the long-awaited Messiah, and they of course began at once their literary propa-

<sup>7</sup> Mishnah *Sanhedrin*, X, 1. See the Palest. and Babyl. Talmuds al.



ganda in the language of the people. Their "gospel" was Aramaic (Moore, *Judaism*, I, 185, 189, and divine inspiration was claimed for these "Messianic" writings (Moore, *ibid.* 244), certainly for Mark, Matthew, and John.

In *these* books, to be sure, there was no formal claim to be inspired Scripture, it was only the virtual claim, that of heralding the Great One, that was made. It was quite a different matter, and one demanding attention, when the ר' יוחנן ה' חנניא, "the Revelation of John," published in Aramaic,<sup>8</sup> would take its place as the rightful successor to the books of Ezekiel, Daniel, and their fellows, repeatedly asserting its claim to be thus ranked. In more than one passage the book is significantly declared to be "prophecy"; thus at both the beginning and the end, 1:3 and 22:7, 10; meaning, that the Holy Spirit had now returned to Israel after the long interval, and this because of the advent of the Messiah, Jesus of Nazareth.

This is made as explicit as possible by the declaration, uttered by an angel, that "the testimony to Jesus is *the spirit of prophecy*" (Rev. 19:10). The same thing is said in another form in 22:6, 7. Moreover, the angel expressly recognizes John as one of the Hebrew Prophets (19:10; 22:9).

This is in a book which was published two years before the destruction of the temple by the Romans; see *Documents of the Primitive Church*, pages 225–244.

The claim formally made in this most impressive of all apocalypses, at a time when large numbers of the common people and even some teachers of the law were turning toward the new sect, demanded attention. It is tempting to conjecture that *this* was what brought forth the ruling by Johanan ben Zakkai that "the Gospels and the books of the Minim"<sup>9</sup> are *not* inspired Scripture.

What other "books" may have been intended in the official ruling, we do not know. The first half of Acts (1:1–15:35) is a

<sup>8</sup> As is fully demonstrated in my *Documents of the Primitive Church*, pages 165–173.

<sup>9</sup> The term denoting the Christians. See the most recent discussion and the conclusion stated by Travis Herford, in *Jewish Studies in Memory of George Alexander Kohut*, pp. 359–369.



relatively sober account of the first spread of Christianity, published in Aramaic at about the middle of the first century. It was written as a simple historical sketch, without any claim or hint of divine authority, but its author made great use of the Hebrew Scriptures, and the little book was decidedly useful for propaganda.

Whether these matters influenced Rabbi Akiba or not, in making his decision, they require to be mentioned. If extra-canonical writings in Aramaic or Hebrew should be banned, and the already existing books should be destroyed, the Christian menace, in so far as it was a literary menace, would be stamped out.

At all events, the evidence is clear and many-sided that there *was* a general prohibition of the nature described and at the time designated, and that it was strictly enforced. It had no concern with writings in the Greek language, or with Greek and other versions of Semitic literature. There could have been no objection to oral tradition, and to citing this or that writing from memory; it was *the written book* that was banned.

The hypothesis of such a literary house-cleaning is not easy to accept. In its magnitude and in the perfection of its accomplishment the undertaking is doubtless without parallel. Only this one people could have effected it, and at only this one time in its history. The edict by Akiba is perfectly attested, and that it was not confined to Sirach but included the other "outside books" is hardly less certain.

Ben Sira's book fared like the others. The existing copies were destroyed, and it was understood that no more copies were to be made. So Rabbi Joseph bar Hiyya evidently understood the matter. The sayings of the wise man of Jerusalem no longer belonged to *Hebrew* literature; the Greek version was always available, and those who wished could read it. This is in accord with the conclusion reached above, that the Genizah Hebrew cannot possibly have been obtained through manuscript tradition, but only as the result of some other process.

The original text was by no means straightway lost, however. The book had been in existence, and popular, for more than two and one-half centuries. In those days, men kept their favorite

literature in their heads, rather than on bookshelves. Ben Sira's proverbs are literature of a sort that is not easily forgotten, they are pungent, concise, and in poetic form. Men recited them to their sons, and they in turn to theirs. Those who knew them by heart, in the first century C. E., were a multitude. The oral transmission was lively and constant, but was not always accurate. The illuminating idea, the striking simile, the sharp admonition may be held in mind and transmitted when the precise form of words is lost. The first of two balanced clauses does not always carry the second clause with it, especially when the same idea is expressed in two different ways. In general, such popular material is liable to be quoted somewhat loosely.

The numerous quotations from Ben Sira found in the Talmud and the Rabbinic literature, whether in Hebrew or in Aramaic, all seem to have been made from memory.<sup>10</sup> As a rule, they differ notably from the Greek and are quite unlike the Cairo Hebrew.

The character of *Heb*, as the Greek version shows with certainty (see above), is that of a text which has so deteriorated from its original form as to become incoherent, whereupon a multitude of gaps have been filled and improvements made by quotations of Scripture, these sometimes apposite, oftener inapposite. The process which lies behind the present result is for the most part obscure, and conjecture is doubtless of very little value.

Our *Heb* comes from Persia, the one quarter of the Jewish world in which a resurrection of the Hebrew Sirach might be thought possible. In all Mesopotamia the book was held in high esteem. Even the Nestorians, who rejected from their list of holy Scripture the Jewish "outside books," made this one exception. At the time when Akiba uttered his prohibition, the book in its Greek form was familiar in this Graeco-Persian region, while the Jews in the various cities knew it also in Hebrew. There is neither evidence nor likelihood that a Syriac version existed at this early date.

<sup>10</sup> Whether there was ever a complete Aramaic text of the Sirach proverbs, is a question which cannot be answered with certainty. Any such version would have been destroyed at the time of the prohibition.

That which has survived to the present day is a Syriac text of the Ben Sira proverbs and a Hebrew version which is based upon it. Neither of the two has been rightly understood.

As to the Syriac version, it seems a plausible conjecture from the extant material that it was made with Jewish help, while the Hebrew tradition was still living, but with constant reference to the Greek (see above). It was a hastily made version, but fairly complete as regards substance. Since *Heb* and *Syr* are in notably close agreement throughout, while the former was believed to be Ben Sira's own text, it was of course taken for granted that *Syr* was based on *Heb*; the contrary, however, is the fact. Reference was made, above, to Lévy's final demonstration that *Heb* is a translation of *Syr* in the alphabetic psalm in chapter 51. Careful investigation will show that the same relation exists throughout the book. There are places, indeed, where the Hebrew appears to be merely a slavishly literal rendering of the Syriac.

It was at some time in the Middle Ages, the date can only be guessed at, that the Hebrew version was made which is partially preserved in the fragments from the Cairo Genizah. It is an interesting curiosity, but the interest is not very great. As a specimen of the Hebrew which Jesus bar Sira of Jerusalem wrote, it is very nearly worthless.



## THE VERACITY OF SCRIPTURE IN PHILO, HALEVI, MAIMONIDES, AND SPINOZA

By H. A. WOLFSON

### I. THE PROBLEM AND ITS SOLUTIONS

To religious philosophers, taken collectively, the problem of the veracity of Scripture presented itself in three parts — one with regard to the historical narrative before the exodus from Egypt, another with regard to the historical narrative after the exodus, and a third with regard to the laws of Moses and the teachings of the other prophets. These constituted three distinct problems, each of them presenting a special difficulty and each of them requiring a special kind of solution.

The part which troubled the mind of religious philosophers the least, was the historical narrative after the exodus. This narrative, presented in Scripture as the record of eyewitnesses, was accepted as authentic history by both Jews and Christians, though not altogether by Moslems. A reflection of this general attitude on the part of Jews is to be found in Halevi, who, after discussing the source of our knowledge of the events before the exodus, when he comes to the events after the exodus, simply says: "And we know what the chronology is from Moses to the present time,"<sup>1</sup> by which he means that our knowledge of that post-Mosaic chronology is in need of no proof, inasmuch as it is attested by eyewitnesses. The argument from the attestation of eyewitnesses is extended by Maimonides even to certain narratives before the exodus, namely, narratives which contain certain details which to him bear the intrinsic evidence of their having been recorded by reliable eyewitnesses.<sup>2</sup>

More of a problem to all those religious philosophers was the prophetic teachings, both the laws of Moses and the teachings

<sup>1</sup> *Cuzari* I, 47: ואנחנו קבלנו מנין שני הקדמונים משה ודוד מה שיש משה ועד עתה.

<sup>2</sup> *Moreh Nebukim* III, 50.



of the other prophets. Presented in Scripture as special revelations from God to men, these laws and teachings seemed to them to be in need of arguments in support of their veracity.

From the very beginning of the attempt to harmonize Scripture and philosophy, four types of arguments were used to establish the divine origin of the laws and teachings of the prophets: (1) the miracles performed by the prophets; (2) the prophetic power to predict future events; (3) the revelation on Mount Sinai; (4) the intrinsic excellency of the laws and teachings of the prophets.

These four types of arguments are all used by Philo. In great detail he describes the miraculous early history of Moses and the numerous miracles performed by him in Egypt and in the desert.<sup>3</sup> He also dwells upon the fulfilment of every thing that Moses predicted in the name of God.<sup>4</sup> Then he represents with many explanations the account of the revelation on Mount Sinai when, in a miraculous way, the voice of God — which, of course, was not a physical voice — was heard by the entire people, men and women alike,<sup>5</sup> and which like any direct experience is itself evidence for its veracity. Finally, there is to him the evidence of the intrinsic excellency of the laws of Moses, their comprehensiveness,<sup>6</sup> their permanence,<sup>7</sup> their universal appeal to all mankind,<sup>8</sup> and their establishment of a perfect way of life in accordance with all the requirements of science and philosophy.<sup>9</sup>

Among the Christian theologians, to mention only one of the earliest among them, Justin Martyr restates three of Philo's arguments in proof of the veracity of both the Old and the New Testament. Speaking of the Old Testament prophets, he says that while "they did not use demonstrations in their treatises", still (1) "they were entitled to credit on account of the miracles which they performed" and also (2) on account of their true

<sup>3</sup> *Mos.* I, 2, 5-59, 327.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* I, 14, 71.

<sup>5</sup> *Decal.* 9, 32-35.

<sup>6</sup> *Mos.* II, 3, 12.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* II, 3, 14.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* II, 4, 17-44.

<sup>9</sup> *Spec. Leg.* I-IV

prophetic predictions, for those events which have happened, and those which are happening, compel you to assent to the utterance made by them," and finally (3) on account of the intrinsic excellence of their teachings, for "their writings are still extant, and he who has read them is very much helped in the knowledge of the beginning and end of things, and of those matters which the philosopher ought to know, provided he believed in them."<sup>10</sup> And speaking of Jesus, he says that the divine origin of his teachings is verified (1) "by the works and by the attendant miracles,"<sup>11</sup> (2) "by the prophecies announced concerning him,"<sup>12</sup> and (3) by the intrinsic excellence of his teachings as is evidenced by the lives of Christians, for "we see and are persuaded that men approach God, leaving their idols and other unrighteousness, through the name of Him who was crucified, Jesus Christ, and abide by their confession, even unto death, and maintain piety."<sup>13</sup>

In Islam, the same three kinds of argument came into play in the discussion of the veracity of the Koran. Tabari uses all the three arguments — the miracles wrought by Mohammed, his predictive power, and the intrinsic merit of his teachings.<sup>14</sup> Algazali stresses the importance of miracles, arguing that the allegorical or rational explanation of them by the philosophers is a denial of the claim of Moses as well as of the other prophets that their teachings were of divine origin.<sup>15</sup> In opposition to him, however, Averroes, drawing upon Avicenna, argues that the test of the truth of prophecy is to be found in "(1) the communication of things hidden, i. e., prediction, and (2) the establishment of laws which are in agreement with truth and which cause the acquisition of habits of conduct leading to the happiness of all created things."<sup>16</sup>

<sup>10</sup> *Dial. cum Tryph.*, 7.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 11; cf. 69.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 35.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 11.

<sup>14</sup> Tabari, *The Book of Religion and Empire*, tr. by A. Mingana, Manchester, 1922, pp. 14, 23, 30.

<sup>15</sup> *Tahafut al-Falasifah*, Phys., ed. M. Bouyges, §§ 6-12, pp. 271-276.

<sup>16</sup> *Tahafut al-Tahafut*, Phys., ed. Bouyges, § 9, p. 516.

It is exactly this kind of argument that Halevi puts into the mouth of his spokesman, the Rabbi, at the beginning of his address to the king of the Khazars in proof of the divine origin of the teachings of Scripture.

He begins, like Justin Martyr, by stating that the truth of the teachings of Scripture, unlike those of the philosophers, are not based upon demonstration.<sup>17</sup> Then he continues to say that the truth of these scriptural teachings may be established by the miracles performed directly by God as well as by those performed by God through Moses,<sup>18</sup> and also by the prophetic power of Moses to know things hidden from everybody and to foretell events that are to take place.<sup>19</sup> Like Philo he dwells upon the revelation on Mount Sinai where the whole assembly of Israel were eyewitnesses to the appearance of God and they themselves heard His voice as He revealed to them the Ten Commandments, which, again like Philo, he tries to explain in conformity with his belief in the incorporeality of God,<sup>20</sup> for before the revelation on Mount Sinai, he says, despite the miracles performed by Moses, "the people did not fully believe that God spoke with man."<sup>21</sup> Finally, he points to the excellency of the teachings of the Law as is evidenced by the lives of those who live according to those teachings<sup>22</sup> and also by their willingness to sacrifice their lives for the sake of those teachings.<sup>23</sup>

This last type of argument is introduced by a question addressed by the Rabbi to the King: "If thou wert told that the King of India was an excellent man, who deserves that you exalt him and do honor to his name and eulogize his deeds on account of the reports that have reached you of the justice of the inhabitants of his land and the excellency of their characters and the uprightness of their business dealings, would this bind you to revere him?"<sup>24</sup> To this, after some hesitation and after the

<sup>17</sup> *Cuzari* I, 13.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.* I, 9; I, 11; I, 25.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.* I, 9; I, 41.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.* I, 89.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.* I, 49; cf. I, 87.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.* I, 19.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.* IV, 16-17.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.* I, 19.



Rabbi has added the fact that the reports from India were brought by reliable eyewitnesses who had seen the king of India, the king of the Khazars admits that he is convinced that such a king does exist in India and that his power and rule are such as are reported to be.<sup>25</sup> A striking parallel is to be found also in Justin Martyr who, in his attempt to show that a knowledge of God can be attained not by philosophy but only through revelation and tradition, makes the unknown stranger ask the following question: "Now, if one were to tell you that in India there is a living creature unlike all others, of such and such a shape, multiform and of various colors, you would have no positive knowledge of it until you had seen it, nor would you give any description of it, except you had heard from an eyewitness." To which Justin answers: "True."<sup>26</sup>

Maimonides, like his contemporary Averroes, rejects miracles as proof of the authenticity of the divine origin of the teaching of Moses and, like Philo and Halevi, dwells upon the direct evidence of those who witnessed the revelation on Mount Sinai. "Moses was not believed by Israel on account of the miracles which he performed, for he who comes to believe by reason of miracles retains in his heart some suspicion that perhaps those miracles were performed by magic and sorcery. All the miracles which Moses performed in the wilderness were performed by him to meet a certain exigency and not as evidence for the truth of prophecy . . . By what, then, were they ultimately brought about to believe in him? By the revelation on Mount Sinai,"<sup>27</sup> which revelation, like Philo and Halevi, he explains in conformity with his belief in the incorporeality of God.<sup>28</sup> Finally, the truth of the Law is to be established, as he himself tries to prove in his work, by the intrinsic excellency of its teachings. "The general object of the Law," he says, "is twofold: the well-being of the soul, and the well-being of the body."<sup>29</sup>

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.* I, 20-24.

<sup>26</sup> *Dial. cum Tryph.*, 3.

<sup>27</sup> *Mishneh Torah, Yesode ha-Torah* I, 8; cf. *Moreh Nebukim* III, 24; *Iggeret Teman, Kovez* II, p. v b; *Introduction to Seder Zera'im*.

<sup>28</sup> *Moreh Nebukim* I, 46; II, 33; III, 9.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.* III, 27.



The most difficult part to defend was the pre-Mosaic part of the Pentateuch. This part, to the mind of religious philosophers, was divided into the history of the universe and the history of mankind. In the history of the universe, the chief teaching of Scripture is that the world was created; in the history of mankind the chief teaching of Scripture is two-fold, namely, that mankind had its origin in Adam and that the history of mankind from Adam to Moses was a comparatively short time, approximately 2500 years. An outline of these three problems are given by both Halevi and Maimonides. Halevi, at the outset of his discussion, makes the Rabbi outline the principles of scriptural teachings as containing information as to how the world was created, how all mankind, with all their geographical dispersions and linguistic divisions, trace their descent ultimately to Adam, and how we know the number of years that had elapsed since the time of Adam.<sup>30</sup> Similarly, Maimonides outlines the principles of scriptural teachings as containing the beliefs that "the world was created, that at the beginning there was created only one individual of the human species and that was Adam, and that the time which elapsed from Adam to Moses was not more than about two thousand five hundred years."<sup>31</sup>

The story of creation presented special problems. Here the scriptural narrative seems to come into conflict with certain other views as to the origin of the world with which philosophers, Jewish, Christian or Moslem, became acquainted. The manner in which this problem was dealt by them does not concern us for the present. But two general observations may be made with regard to the story of creation.

First, from Philo throughout Christian, Moslem and Jewish philosophy, there was a general tendency to disregard the literalness of the story of creation and to harmonize it with what each particular philosopher happened to believe with regard to the origin of the world.

<sup>30</sup> *Cuzari* I, 43; ויחס בני אדם קודם המבול, היאך נתיחסו אל אדם . . . ויחס השבטים אומות אל שם חם ויפת בני נח . . . ושני העולם מאדם ועד עתה.

<sup>31</sup> *Morch Nebukim* III, 50: ואשר נברא תחלה: . . . והוא אדם הראשון, ולא היה באורך הזמן אשר מאדם עד משה רבנו היה איש אחד ממין האדם, והוא אדם הראשון, ולא היה באורך הזמן אשר מאדם עד משה רבנו רק אלפים וחמש מאות שנה בקרוב.

Second, irrespective of their individual interpretation of the story of creation in the Book of Genesis, they all considered the act of creation as an act of divine will and hence a miraculous act. Thus Philo,<sup>32</sup> Tertullian,<sup>33</sup> Augustine,<sup>34</sup> Halevi,<sup>35</sup> and Maimonides<sup>36</sup> — all of them invoke the act of creation as proof for the possibility of miracles.

## II. THE ORIGIN OF LANGUAGES, THE HEBDOMADAL PERIOD, AND THE DENARY SYSTEM

But whatever their views were with regard to the creation of the world, all religious philosophers took literally the belief in the Adamic descent of mankind. Jews and Christians were bound to this belief by the teaching of the Hebrew Scripture. Moslems considered themselves also bound to this belief by the repetition of the story of the creation of Adam as the first man in the Koran. Halevi speaks for the philosophers of all the three religions when he says that whatever the scriptural teachings with regard to creation may be, it definitely teaches that "the world was created at a certain time and that Adam, through Noah, was the origin of the human species."<sup>37</sup> Both Halevi and Maimonides, therefore, undertake to prove the Adamic descent of man.

The proofs, logically, are all of the same type. They all try to show that the belief in the Adamic descent of mankind gives the most satisfactory explanation of the origin of certain institutions which exist today. They all seem to start by saying: We have nowadays certain human institutions. These human institutions, they then argue, must have had a beginning. But they could not have had their beginning in a multitudinous society. They, therefore, conclude that all these institutions

<sup>32</sup> *Mos.* I, 38, 212.

<sup>33</sup> *De Resurrectione Carnis*, ch. XI.

<sup>34</sup> *De Civ. Dei* XXI, 7.

<sup>35</sup> *Cuzari* I, 91.

<sup>36</sup> *Moreh Nebukim* II, 25; *Ma'amar Teḥiyyat ha-Metim*, *Kobez* II, p. 10 v b; ed. Finkel, c. 42, p. 30.

<sup>37</sup> *Cuzari* I, 67.

must have begun with one man, and that man was Adam, the father of the entire human race. Halevi, who leads the discussion on this point, takes as the subject of his argument three human institutions, language, the hebdomadal period, and the denary system.

His discussion of language occurs in three brief passages in different places in his work.<sup>38</sup> These disconnected passages are to be connected and welded into one continuous argument, and to understand the full implication of that argument we must reconstruct the historical background to which certain terms in that argument refer or allude.

In Greek philosophy there was a controversy over the question whether language had a "conventional" or a "natural" origin. Upon examination, however, we find that the terms conventional and natural in this controversy were used in three different senses. To begin with, the term conventional was contrasted with the term natural and meant that names were invented by man and were attached to things arbitrarily without any relation to the nature of the things to which they were attached. It is in this sense that Aristotle contrasts convention and nature when he says that "by a name we mean a sound significant by convention *κατὰ συνθήκην*,"<sup>39</sup> because "nothing is by nature (*φύσει*) a name."<sup>40</sup> Then the term conventional, instead of being contrasted with the term natural, was used as supplementary to it and meant that names were indeed invented by somebody, but their invention as well as their application to things was not arbitrary, for all those invented names expressed the nature of things to which they were applied. It is in this sense that Plato combines the term convention with the term nature when, in his discussion of the origin of names, he says that in addition to "likeness" or "nature" we are compelled to add "convention,"<sup>41</sup> so that "he who first gave names, gave such names as agreed with his conception of the nature of things."<sup>42</sup>

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.* I, 53-57; II, 72; III, 25.

<sup>39</sup> *De Interpr.*, 2, 16a, 19.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 27-28.

<sup>41</sup> *Cratylus* 435 C.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.* 436 B.



Finally, the term "natural" was contrasted with the term "conventional" and meant that names were not invented by some name-giver but have rather grown out spontaneously of natural cries like those uttered by animals. It is in this sense that Epicurus contrasts the term natural with the term conventional when he is reported to have said that "the names of things were not originally due to convention or arrangement (*θέσει*), but men's natures (*φύσεις*) according to their different nationalities, suffering peculiar feelings and receiving peculiar impressions, properly emitted air moulded into shape by each of these feelings and impressions, differing according to the difference of the regions which the nationalities inhabited."<sup>43</sup>

These Greek theories as to the origin of language were brought into play by Philo in his philosophic interpretation of Scripture. Commenting on the verse which reads to the effect that God brought every animal to Adam that he might give them their names,<sup>44</sup> he says that this verse admonishes students of philosophy that "names proceed from arrangement (*ex positione*=*θέσει*) and not from nature (*ex natura*=*φύσει*), for a natural (*naturalis*) nomenclature is with peculiar fitness assigned to each creature when a man of wisdom and pre-eminent knowledge appears."<sup>45</sup> The statement in this passage with regard to the peculiar fitness of the names given by Adam is elsewhere repeated by him in his statement that the names given by Adam brought out clearly "the peculiarities (*ιδιότητας*) of the creatures who bore them,"<sup>46</sup> or that they were "their appropriate names."<sup>47</sup> The scriptural proof-text for his view is the verse which is quoted by him as "Whatsoever Adam called anything, that was the name thereof" (Gen. 2:19).<sup>48</sup> The reason why Adam was given the task of naming the animals was due to the fact that "he was the first person who deserved to govern them all as their chief."<sup>49</sup>

<sup>43</sup> Diogenes X, 75. Cf. Gomperz, *Greek Thinkers*, I, 394-398; III, 165; Bailey, *The Greek Atomists and Epicurus*, pp. 267-269; 380-382.

<sup>44</sup> Gen. 2:19. <sup>45</sup> *Qu. in Gen.* I, 20.

<sup>46</sup> *Opif.* 52, 149.

<sup>47</sup> *Mut.* 9, 63.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*; but cf. quotation of this verse in *Qu. in Gen.* I, 22.

<sup>49</sup> *Qu. in Gen.* I, 20; *Opif.* 52, 148.



From these statements of Philo we may gather the particular senses in which he uses the terms nature and convention. With regard to the term nature, he rejects its use in the Epicurean sense that names developed out of natural sounds without any convention, but he uses it in the Platonic and Aristotelian sense that names express the nature of the objects of which they are names. Then, with regard to the term convention, he openly rejects its use in the sense that names are merely arbitrary terms without any relation to the nature of the things of which they are names, but he accepts, by implication, its use in the sense that names were given to things by some name-giver and were not merely the spontaneous outgrowth of natural sounds. His view thus reflects exactly the view of Plato. He differs, however, from Plato in that the human name-giver, according to him, was endowed by God with a special gift for that purpose, for, commenting upon the verse in which God is said to have given to Adam the power to have dominion over the animals (Gen. 1:28), he says that Adam was enabled to give appropriately fitting names to all things because he "was wise with wisdom self-learned and self-taught, having been created by the grace of God."<sup>50</sup> From this statement by itself it is not clear whether he means by it that Adam was created by God with a special name-giving faculty or whether he means by it that Adam was directly inspired by God to give those names to all animals. The latter interpretation, however, would seem to be more likely, for elsewhere he uses the expressions "enacted ordinances" (*τεθειμένα διατάγματα*) and "enacted laws" (*τεθέντες νόμοι*), by which he means conventional ordinances or laws, in the sense of laws revealed by God<sup>51</sup> and he similarly used the expression "self-learned wisdom" and "self-taught wisdom" in the sense of wisdom which comes by revelation and prophesy, described by him as being caused by God "to spring up within the soul."<sup>52</sup> As for the language used by Adam in giving those names, it may be assumed that Philo believed that it was Hebrew and, as for the subsequent rise of a multiplicity of languages, it may be also

<sup>50</sup> *Opif.* 52, 148.

<sup>51</sup> *Abr.* I, 5; cf. my *Philo*, II, 189.

<sup>52</sup> *Sacr.* 22, 78; 23, 79; cf. *Philo*, I, 36.

assumed that he regarded the story of the confusion of tongues, which was caused directly by God, as an explanation of what he describes as the "origin of the Greek and barbarian languages."<sup>53</sup> How these various languages arose as a result of this confusion — whether the new languages, just as the confusion itself, arose by a direct intervention of God or whether, unlike the confusion itself, they developed naturally — he does not explain. But from his statement that what Moses called "confusion of tongues" means "the division of speech into a multitude of different kinds of language"<sup>54</sup> it may be inferred that God who caused the confusion of tongues also caused the formation of the different languages.

The rabbinic treatment of the names given by Adam to the animals and of the confusion of tongues contain statements which are parallel to those we have quoted from Philo. Like Philo, the rabbis say that Adam "gave to every living being a name suitable to it"<sup>55</sup> or that "everything the Holy One, blessed be He, created in His world was named by Him according to its disposition."<sup>56</sup> Again, like Philo, they connect the power given to Adam to name the animal with the power given him to govern them. This view is expressed in a comment upon the verse "And the Lord said unto him, who hath made Adam's mouth" (Exod. 4:11), which reads as follows: "God answered Moses, saying unto him: Moses, Moses, who hath made Adam's mouth? It is I who hath made Adam's mouth and tongue, for I have made him overseer of all those who came into the world, to govern with care all the creatures of the world and to call each one of them by its name, that is to say, to give a name to each of them."<sup>57</sup> Like Philo, too, if our interpretation of his statement

<sup>53</sup> *Conf.* 38, 190.

<sup>54</sup> *Conf.* 4, 9.

<sup>55</sup> *Midrash ha-Gadol* on Gen. 2:20: שֶׁקָרָא לְכָל אֶחָד וְאֶחָד שֵׁם הָרְאוּ לוֹ; cf. *Genesis Rabbah* 17, 4.

<sup>56</sup> *Sefer ha-Bahir*, 35, ed. Wilna, 1883, p. 8d: כָּל מַה שֶּׁבְּרָא הַקֹּב"ה בְּעוֹלָמוֹ שֵׁם שֶׁמוֹ; מענינו. Cf. M. Kasher, *Torah Shelemah* on Gen. 2:20.

<sup>57</sup> *Midrash Alpha Beta de-Rabbi Akiba*, under *Pe* (Jellinek, *Bet ha-Midrash*, III, 43): מְשִׁיב הַקֹּב"ה וְאָמַר לוֹ. מִשָּׁה, מִשָּׁה, מִי שֶׁ פָּה לְאָדָם הָרִאשׁוֹן, שֶׁנֶּאֱמַר וַיֹּאמֶר ה' אֵלָיו (III, 43): מִי שֶׁ פָּה לְאָדָם (שְׁמוֹת ד' י"א), אֲנִי הוּא שֶׁשְׁמִי פָה וּלְשׁוֹן לְאָדָם הָרִאשׁוֹן, שֶׁהִפְקַדְתִּי עָלַי כָּל בְּרִיָּה עוֹלָם כְּפִקְדֵי לְהַפְקִיד כָּל בְּרִיּוֹת שֶׁבְּעוֹלָם וּלְקַרְאוֹ כָּל אֶחָד וְאֶחָד בְּשֵׁמוֹ וּלְשֵׁם שְׁמוֹת לְכָל בְּרִיָּה וּבְרִיָּה Cf. Kasher, *op. cit.* on Gen. 2:19.

is correct, they say that Adam "gave names to the living beings by the Holy Spirit."<sup>58</sup> As for the language spoken by Adam, the rabbis evidently held it to be Hebrew, inasmuch as Hebrew is said by them to be the language with which the world was created.<sup>59</sup> According to one rabbinic statement, however, Adam spoke Aramaic.<sup>60</sup> As for the multiplicity of languages, while one rabbi says that seventy languages had already existed prior to the confusion,<sup>61</sup> others say that "the Holy One, blessed be He, together with the seventy angels who surround His throne of glory, came down and mixed up their language so that it became seventy languages, giving to each nation its own script and its own language and appointing an angel over each language."<sup>62</sup>

In Christianity, Origen, like Philo, rejects the view that names are arbitrarily given to things and argues that they express the nature of things.<sup>63</sup> Similarly Tertullian says that the names given by Adam to the animals was "on the ground of the present purpose which each particular nature served" and also that they were called, "as each nature was, by that to which from the beginning it showed a propensity."<sup>64</sup> As for the language spoken by Adam, it is generally assumed by the Church Fathers that it was Hebrew,<sup>65</sup> called the "divine language,"<sup>66</sup> and as for the multiplicity of languages, it is explained, as in Scripture, by the story of the confusion of languages at the Tower of Babel.<sup>67</sup>

In Islam, with reference to the names given by Adam, the Koran says, "And God taught Adam names of all things."<sup>68</sup> In

<sup>58</sup> *Midrash Lekah Tob* on Gen. 2:19: קרא להן שמות: cf. Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, V, p. 83, n. 30.

<sup>59</sup> *Bereshit Rabbah* 18, 4; cf. Ginzberg, *op. cit.*, V, p. 205.

<sup>60</sup> *Sanhedrin* 38b.

<sup>61</sup> *Jer. Megillah* I, 11, p. 71b.

<sup>62</sup> *Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer*, 24: וירד הקב"ה ושבעים המלאכים הסובבים כסא כבודו: ובלבל את לשונם לשבעים לשון. כל אחד ואחד כתבו ולשונו. ופנה מלאך על כל לשון ולשון.

<sup>63</sup> *Contra Celsum* I, 24; V, 45; *Exhortatio ad Martyrium*, 46.

<sup>64</sup> *De Virginibus Velandis*, 5.

<sup>65</sup> Augustine, *De Civ. Dei* XVI, 11.

<sup>66</sup> Origen, *Contra Celsum* V, 30.

<sup>67</sup> *Contra Celsum* V, 31; *De Civit. Dei* XVI, 4-5.

<sup>68</sup> *Surah* 2:19.



the Ikhwān al-Ṣafā, reflecting additional influences going back either to Philo or to rabbinic traditions, it is said: "God breathed into Adam of His Holy Spirit and strengthened Him with His word and taught him the names of all things as well as the properties (*ṣifāt*) of all things."<sup>69</sup> The language spoken by Adam, however, was not Hebrew but rather Syriac or Nabathean,<sup>70</sup> the latter of which is evidently used as the equivalent of Syriac.<sup>71</sup> This identification of Adam's language as Syriac may be due to the influence of the Talmudic statement quoted above that "Adam spoke Aramaic."<sup>72</sup> But it is also possible that the term Syriac here stands for Hebrew and the statement may therefore ultimately be traced to the influence of Philo who sometimes identifies Hebrew with Chaldean,<sup>73</sup> the latter in the sense of Aramaic. In the Koran, however, while there may be a vague reference to the tower of Babel,<sup>74</sup> there is no statement that that was the cause of the confusion of languages. Hence Moslems did not consider themselves bound to accept the scriptural explanation of the origin of the multiplicity of languages. Different explanations are therefore given by Moslem authors. Mas'ūdī, evidently accepts the scriptural story of the tower of Babel, but, going beyond the scriptural story, makes God not only the cause of the confusion of their language but also the cause of the division of languages,<sup>75</sup> that is to say, the formation of the new languages. The Ikhwān al-Ṣafā, however, came out in opposition to the view of those whom they describe as explaining the division of languages by "corruption" (*fasād*).<sup>76</sup> The reference here is undoubtedly to the scriptural explanation which is usually referred to as the "confusion" of languages,

<sup>69</sup> *Rasā'il*, ed. Bombay, 1305 A. H., Vol. II, p. 404, ll. 14-15; cf. Vol. II, p. 384, l. 18: "God taught Adam the names of all things."

<sup>70</sup> Ikhwan al-Ṣafa, *op. cit.*, II, p. 385, l. 5; Mas'ūdī, *Muruj*, ed. Barbier de Meynard et Pavet de Courteille, Vol. III, p. 270; Vol. II, pp. 94, 106.

<sup>71</sup> Mas'ūdī, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 94; Nöldeke, "Die Namen der aramaischen Nation und Sprache," *ZDMG*, 25 (1871), 122-127.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. above, n. 60.

<sup>73</sup> *Mos.* II, 5, 26; cf. Siegfried, *Philo von Alexandria*, p. 144.

<sup>74</sup> Surah 16:28.

<sup>75</sup> *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 78-79; Vol. III, p. 270.

<sup>76</sup> *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 388, ll. 20-21.



for so also Ibn Janah, in his Hebrew lexicon written in Arabic, takes the Hebrew term *balal*, which is usually translated "to confuse," to mean (1) "to corrupt" (*afsada*) and (2) "to change" (*ghayyara*).<sup>77</sup> The explanation which the Ikhwān al-Ṣafā themselves advance for the rise of the various languages is that it was due to differences in the organs of speech.<sup>78</sup>

Repercussions of all this are to be noticed in Halevi's treatment of the origin of languages as evidence of the Adamic descent of men.

He starts out by prodding the King into committing himself to three propositions with regard to the variety of languages which existed at his own time.

First, he makes the king commit himself to the proposition that languages are not "eternal and without a beginning" but that they "undoubtedly had come into existence as a result of convention."<sup>79</sup> By denying that languages are "eternal and without beginning" he means here to deny the Epicurean contention that language sprang up originally without an agent but by that process of chance which they describe as nature, that is to say, out of the natural cries uttered by men. The term "eternal" here is loosely used in the sense of "without a beginning," that is, without a cause. As proof of this he points to the fact that languages "are made up of nouns, verbs, and particles, all of which consist of sounds derived from the organs (*maḥarij*) of speech."<sup>80</sup> This, we take it, is an argument against the Epicurean theory of the natural origin of language. Languages, he seems to say, could not have developed out of natural sounds

<sup>77</sup> Ibn Janah, *Sefer ha-Shorashim*, s. v.

<sup>78</sup> *Op. cit.* II, p. 388, ll. 19–20.

<sup>79</sup> *Cuzari* I, 53–54: נ"ן. אמר החבר: האתה רואה שלהשונות קדומות אין להם החלה. נ"ד. אמר הכוזרי: אבל הם חדשות מוסכם עליהם מוסכם, *muṣṭalah*, in this passage (*iṣṭilāhiyy*, הסכמי, in *Cuzari* II, 64, and in *Moreh Nebukim* II, 30) is the Greek *συνθήκη*, *κατὰ συνθήκην*, "by convention" (see above, n. 39). The term *madū*, מונה, or *waḍ'iyy*, הנחי, (*Moreh Nebukim* II, 40) is the Greek *θέσει*, *κατὰ θέσιν*, "by arrangement" (see above, nn. 43 and 45. Both of these terms are in opposition to *ṭab'iyy*, טבעי, *φύσει*, *κατὰ φύσιν*, "by nature" (see above n. 40 and 45).

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.* I, 54: ומלוח (ואלאפעל) והפעלים (אל אסמא) והשמות (אל אסמא) והפעלים (ואלאפעל) (מכראן אלנשק) (ואלחרוף) והם מן האותיות (אלאצואת) הלקוחות ממוצאי הרבור (מכראן אלנשק).

like those of animals, for there is a fundamental difference between them. The sounds of cries or animals, while they may be significant, are irrational, whereas language is speech which is not only significant but also rational, consisting as it does of certain parts of speech arranged in a certain order. The passage thus interpreted reflects the following statements with regard to language. Sounds (*al-aṣwāt*) are divided into significant (*mafhūmah*) and insignificant, the former being those of animals and the latter those of inanimate objects. Significant sounds, again, are divided into rational (*manṭiqiyyah*) and irrational, the former being those of men and the latter those of other animals. The rational sounds of men are called speech (*manṭiq*), for "speech consists only of sounds which proceed from the organs of voice (*maḥarij*) and can be decomposed into letters."<sup>81</sup>

Second, while admitting that languages have come into existence as a result of convention, the King is forced to answer in the negative to the question put to him by the rabbi "Did you ever see any one who contrived a language, or didst thou hear of him?"<sup>82</sup> The implication of this negative answer is that while in theory language could not spring up naturally but must have its origin in the act of a rational agent, practically he could not conceive of the possibility of such an origin for language. Why he could not conceive of such an origin of language he does not tell us here in this connection. But elsewhere in connection with the problem of chronology he tells us why it is impossible to conceive of the Mosaic chronology to have originated by convention. How did that convention come about? he asks there. If it were the result of a collusion on the part of many people, then, he argues, even if it involved only ten people, it would be impossible for them to carry out their plan "without their hav-

<sup>81</sup> Ikhwan al-Safa, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 377, ll. 1-6. Cf. the following outline based upon Diogenes Laertius, VII, 55 and 57; *De Anima* II, 8, 29-33: Voice (*φωνή*) is either (a) a mere noise (*ῥῆχος*) or (b) the inarticulate sound (*ψόφος*) of an animal, the latter of which may be significant (*σημαντικός*). Speech (*λέξις*) is articulate and rational (*ἀπὸ διανοίας*).

<sup>82</sup> *Cuzari* I, 55-56: נ"ה. אמר החבר: הראית בודה לשון מלכו או שמעת עליו. נ"ו. אמר הכוזרי: לא ראיתי ולא שמעתי.

ing a falling-out and betraying the secret of their collusion."<sup>83</sup> And if it were the concoction of an individual, then, he argues again, it would be impossible that "they should not reject the words of him who would try to impose upon them the belief in such a chronology."<sup>84</sup> The same kind of argument was undoubtedly in the mind of Halevi here when he makes the king say that he never saw or heard of a language coming into existence by contrivance or convention. In fact, Epicurus, in his argument against the theory of the conventional origin of language, assuming that one man invented language and then tried to impose it upon others, argues in exactly the same way. "One man," he says, "could not avail to constrain many, and vanquish them to his will, that they should be willing to learn all his names for things."<sup>85</sup>

And so the King is forced to deny that the multiplicity of languages of his time had either a natural beginning, that is, uncaused by any agent, or a conventional beginning, that is, caused by a human agent. But still he is forced to admit that "undoubtedly languages appeared at some time."<sup>86</sup> How, then, did these languages appear? The answer, he wants us to conclude, is to be found in the scriptural story of the Tower of Babel. It came as a result of the confusion of languages. But how this division of languages did result from the confusion of languages, whether, as in Philo and Mas'udi, God himself not only caused the confusion of languages but also caused the division of languages, or whether God only caused the confusion of languages but their division afterwards came about in some other way, Halevi does not say. His contemporary Abraham Ibn Ezra advances three interpretations of the confusion and division of languages. "Some say that they began to hate one another and each one invented a new language. Others say that He Who teaches man knowledge caused them to forget the knowledge of their language. What appears to me as the correct interpretation is that they were scattered abroad [by God] from thence . . .

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.* I, 48; cf. below, n. 124.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*; cf. below n. 125.

<sup>85</sup> Lucretius, V, 1050-1051.

<sup>86</sup> *Cuzari*, I, 56: ואין ספק שהגיעו אליה ברור מהדורות.



and after many years, when the first generation died, the original language was forgotten."<sup>87</sup> From all this it would appear that whatever God's share in the confusion or the forgetfulness of the original language, the invention of the new languages was due to natural causes. This is evidently contrary to the view of Philo and Mas'udi. Whether Halevi's view was in agreement with that of Ibn Ezra cannot be ascertained.

But then the King continues to say that undoubtedly also "before this division of languages there were no different languages which had been adopted by different peoples as a result of different conventions."<sup>88</sup> What he means to say is this: Inasmuch as we are bound to accept the scriptural story of the confusion and division of languages as the best possible explanation of the origin of the languages which exist today, we must also accept the scriptural story that before that division of languages there was only one language and that one language did not originate in a multitude of people, either naturally or conventionally. That one language originated with one man who existed alone and who formed the beginning of the human race. With that one man language originated by a divine act. It was a "divine" language, "created and instituted" by God who "taught it to Adam and placed it on his tongue and in his heart."<sup>89</sup> Again that language which Adam was taught by God was "the most perfect of languages and the most fitted to describe the objects named by it,"<sup>90</sup> for every living creature given a name by Adam "deserved that name which fitted it and explained its nature."<sup>91</sup> This, as we have seen, is exactly the view of Philo. Like Philo, therefore, we may say, while Halevi would not describe the origin of language as conventional in the sense of man-made and natural in the sense of being without an agent,

<sup>87</sup> Abraham Ibn Ezra on Gen. 11:7: ויש אומרים שנהפך לבם לשנוא זה את זה וכל אחד חידש לשון. ויש אומרים כי התלמד לאדם שכתם דעת לשונם. והנכון בעיני שנפוצו משם . . . ובמים רבים, במות הדור הראשון, נשכח הלשון הראשון.

<sup>88</sup> *Cuzari*, I, 56: וזאת היתה קודם לשון שהסכימו עליה מהסכמת עם מבלתי עם על לשון.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.* IV, 25 (ed. Hirschfeld, p. 269, ll. 25-26): והלשון האלהית הברואה אשר לשוננו הנוצרת הברואה: Cf. II, 72 (p. 129, l. 2).

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.* IV, 25 (p. 269, l. 27): השלמה מכל הלשונות והנאותה לקרואיה יותר מכלם.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.* IV, 25 (p. 271, l. 1): וכל אשר יקרא לו האדם נפש חיה הוא שמו, רוצה לומר: שהוא ראוי לשם ההוא ונאות לי יתלמד על טבעו.



he would describe it as conventional in the sense of God-made and as natural in the sense of expressing the nature of things.

Thus the origin of language is used by Halevi to explain the Adamic descent of man, for by that theory alone, he argues, we can extricate ourselves from the difficulties as to the origin of language.

A suggestion of the argument for the Adamic descent of mankind from the origin of languages is to be found also in Maimonides statement that it was in order to lend credence to the belief that "at the beginning there was created only one individual of the human species and that is Adam" that the Pentateuch describes the cause of "the formation of their different languages after they had . . . spoken one language, as would be natural for the descendants of one person."<sup>92</sup> Put in the form of argument, this statement tries to show how Scripture gives a satisfactory explanation for the rise of languages by the story of the Tower of Babel and the story of Adam. As to how language originated with Adam, Maimonides tells us in another passage. Commenting on the verse, "And Adam gave names" (Gen. 2:20), he says: "This teaches us that languages are conventional, and that they are not natural, as has been assumed by some."<sup>93</sup> This statement has been taken to mean that names of things, according to Maimonides, are only arbitrary terms without telling us anything of the nature of the things of which they are names,<sup>94</sup> thus siding with Aristotle's view against the view which is generally identified with Plato and the Stoics. According to some commentators, this statement also means that the language spoken by Adam was man-made and not created by God, so that Hebrew, the language spoken by Adam, is called sacred, according to Maimonides, not because it was instituted by God but only because it is a chaste and refined language,<sup>95</sup> and consequently also Maimonides is taken to be in

<sup>92</sup> *Moreh Nebukim* III, 50.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.* II, 30: למדנו שהלשונות נבראו על ידי אדם הראשון, וזהו שכתוב (שם) כי בראשית ברא אלהים אדם בלשון אחת, וכל לשון אחת היא לשון אדם, וזהו שכתוב (שם) כי בראשית ברא אדם בלשון אחת, וכל לשון אחת היא לשון אדם.

<sup>94</sup> See Narboni, Shem-Ṭob, and Munk (II, 254, n. 2), *ad loc.*

<sup>95</sup> See Shem Ṭob, *ad loc.* For Maimonides' explanation of "sacred language" see *Moreh Nebukim* III, 8.

opposition to Halevi.<sup>96</sup> None of these inferences, however, necessarily follow from Maimonides' statement. The term "conventional," as we have seen, may mean not only "arbitrary" but also "man-made" or "God-made" and the term "natural" may mean not only to be expressive of the nature of things but also to be grown up spontaneously without a founder. Accordingly what Maimonides may mean by his statement here is merely the assertion that languages are "conventional" in the sense that they are founded by somebody, that is, Adam, who was taught by God; and are "not natural" in the sense that they have not grown up spontaneously without a founder. The "some" in the expression "as has been assumed by some" would thus refer to the Epicureans. In another passage, Maimonides speaks of language as a "boon with which God favored man" and quotes scriptural verses to show that it is God who "gave a mouth" (Ex. 4:11) or "a learned tongue" (Is. 50:4) to man.<sup>97</sup> This, too, may not mean merely that God endowed men with a capacity to institute language by convention; it may mean exactly the same as Halevi's statement that the language spoken by Adam was "created and instituted" by God who "taught it to Adam and placed it on his tongue and in his heart."<sup>98</sup>

Halevi's other two arguments for the Adamic descent of mankind, those of the hebdomadal period<sup>99</sup> and the denary system,<sup>100</sup> are based upon two assumptions. First, both the hebdomadal period and the denary system are universally accepted by all mankind. Second, both of them have no foundation either in nature or in reason. On the basis of these assumptions, how then, Halevi seems to ask, did these originate? To say that they originated by convention must be rejected on the same ground that the theory of convention has been rejected by him in the case of the origin of language. Hence it must be assumed that

<sup>96</sup> Cf. Munk (*loc cit.*) and Friedlander (II, 157, n. 3), *ad loc.*

<sup>97</sup> *Moreh Nebukim* III, 8: שוה הדבור בלשון הוא מסנולת בני אדם וטובה נמלה השם לאדם להברילו בה משאר בעלי חיים.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. above, n. 89.

<sup>99</sup> *Cuzari* I, 57-58; II, 20 (p. 85, ll. 2-4).

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.* I, 59; IV, 27 (p. 285, ll. 8-10).

they originated in some "divinely mysterious way"<sup>101</sup> with one man, and that is Adam,<sup>102</sup> from whom all his descendants inherited it as a tradition.

Maimonides uses neither of these arguments as proof for the Adamic descent of mankind. Whether he omitted these arguments because he did not happen to discuss this problem directly or whether he omitted them because he was informed that the hebdomadal period was unknown among the ancient Persians, Greeks and Romans and that the denary system had its rival in the quinary and vigesimal systems cannot be ascertained. On one point, however, it is certain that he differed from Halevi. He held that the hebdomadal period had both a natural and a rational explanation, for "the period of seven days is the unit of time intermediate between the natural day and the lunar month and it is also known how great is the importance of this period in nature."<sup>103</sup> Similarly Philo makes no use of either of these arguments as proof of the Adamic descent of mankind, believing in a natural or rational origin for both the denary system and the hebdomadal period. Number ten to him is the perfect number which he found in nature.<sup>104</sup> As for the hebdomadal period, while in one place he says that without the guidance of the divine spirit Moses could not have announced the Sabbath,<sup>105</sup> in another place he says that "nature taught men the only, or to speak more cautiously, the chief festivals, namely, the recurring periods of seven days and seven years."<sup>106</sup>

### III. THE SCRIPTURAL CHRONOLOGY

While the Jewish belief in the creation of the world and the creation of Adam was shared by both Christianity and Islam, the belief in the scriptural chronology was shared only by Chris-

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.* IV, 27 (p. 285, l. 10): אבל לסוד אלהי, in connection with the denary system; so undoubtedly also in the case of the hebdomadal period.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.* II, 20 (p. 85, ll. 2-4), in connection with the denary period.

<sup>103</sup> *Moreh Nebukim* III, 43: מפני שהקף השבעה ימים הוא הקף בינוני בין היום השמש ו. והחדש הירחי, וכבר ידעת שלזה ההקף סבוא גדול בעינינו הטבעיים.

<sup>104</sup> *Decal.* 7, 24-8, 31.

<sup>105</sup> *Mos.* II 48. 265.

<sup>106</sup> *Praem.* 48, 265.



tianity but not by Islam. This last belief, unlike the first two beliefs, did not have to defend itself against any theory of an eternal chronology. Among Greek philosophers, even Aristotle, who believed in the eternity of the world and hence the eternity of the human race, admitted the recency of the arts and, hence, of our present social history and civilization in general, though this recency is explained by him as being due to the devastation of former civilizations in these parts of the world inhabited by us.<sup>107</sup> Philo, starting with this commonly admitted belief in the recency of our civilization, argues in favor of the scriptural teaching of the recent origin of the human race,<sup>108</sup> concerning which he accepts the scriptural story that it began with the creation of Adam.<sup>109</sup> Though he does not dwell directly on the veracity of the scriptural chronology, the fact that he places the historical part of Scripture by the side of the story of creation and the legislative part<sup>110</sup> shows that he considered it of equal veracity. Undoubtedly Philo was acquainted with the legend reported by Plato concerning an Egyptian priest who had told Solon of the founding of Athens nine thousand years before his time,<sup>111</sup> but, if challenged with it, he would have undoubtedly dismissed it, as he does all myths in general, as an "imposture" in contrast to the "truth" of Scripture.<sup>112</sup> In fact, later in Christianity, when Celsus tried to refute the scriptural chronology by "Plato" and "the most learned of the Egyptians," evidently referring to the legend we have quoted from the *Timaeus*, Origen declared that "the dialogues of Plato" and the "fables" of the "boastful Egyptians" are not by any means to be regarded as more trustworthy than the Mosaic account in the Pentateuch.<sup>113</sup> Augustine, evidently drawing on this reference to Celsus in Origen, equally dismisses as untrustworthy "those mendacious documents [of the Egyptians] which

<sup>107</sup> *Meteor.* I, 14, 351b, 8 ff.

<sup>108</sup> *Aet.* 24, 130.

<sup>109</sup> *Opif.* 23, 69 ff.

<sup>110</sup> *Mos.* II, 8, 46; *Praem.* I, 1-2.

<sup>111</sup> *Tim.* 23 D-E.

<sup>112</sup> *Praem.* 2, 8; cf. *Philo*, I, 32,

<sup>113</sup> *Contra Celsum* I, 19-20.

profess to give the history of many thousands of years, though, reckoning by the sacred writings, we find that not 6,000 years have yet passed."<sup>114</sup>

In Islam, however, a distinction was made between scriptural beliefs which happen to be restated in the Koran and those which do not happen to be restated in it. Accordingly, the belief in the creation of the world and in the creation of Adam which are restated in the Koran is accepted, whereas the scriptural chronology which is not restated in the Koran is not accepted. Mas'udi thus declares that religious philosophers among the Moslems say that "demonstrations may establish the creation of the world" as well as the belief that "the beginning of men is from Adam" but that "it is impossible for us to determine and count up the years,"<sup>115</sup> adding that "God has informed us in His Book that He created Adam . . . but He has not furnished us any information with regard to the extent of time that has elapsed since then."<sup>116</sup> Moslems, therefore, gave no more credence to the scriptural chronology than to the other chronologies known to them. Of such other chronologies known to Moslems were not only those of the Greeks but also those of the Indians<sup>117</sup> and Sabians.<sup>118</sup>

It is against this disregard of the scriptural chronology by the Moslems and the equal regard given by them to the Indian and Sabian chronologies that Halevi undertakes to defend the scriptural chronology. It will be noticed that the Moslem in his speech is made by Halevi to say that he believes in "creation of the world and the genealogical descent of all men from Adam through Noah."<sup>119</sup> But he does not express his belief in the scriptural chronology. This was advisedly omitted by Halevi from the speech of the Moslem. When the Rabbi, however, comes to speak, Halevi makes him say that he believes not only in the creation of the world and in the Adamic descent of man-

<sup>114</sup> *De Civ. Dei* XII, 10, cf. XVIII, 40.

<sup>115</sup> Mas'udi, *op. cit.*, Vol. IV, p. 110.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 111.

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 105.

<sup>118</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 106.

<sup>119</sup> *Cuzari* I, 5: אנחנו מקיימים . . . החדוש לעולם והיחש אל אדם ונח.

kind but also in "the chronology from Adam up to this day."<sup>120</sup> But no sooner does the Rabbi say that than the King is made by Halevi to take him up on the last point, asking him: "It is strange that you should possess authentic chronology to the creation of the world."<sup>121</sup>

In his answer, Halevi tries first to establish by positive arguments the authenticity of the scriptural chronology.

To begin with, he advances in its support the principle of consensus. "There is no difference," he says, "between the Jews of Khazar and Ethiopia in this respect."<sup>122</sup> The force of this argument can be realized only when we recall that it is addressed to Moslem readers, for among Moslems, the principle of consensus (*ijmā'*) plays an important part in their own religion.

Then he tries to show that such a consensus among the Jews make it humanly impossible for that chronology to have come about by "convention" or rather collusion. The argument used here by Halevi is, as we have pointed out above, analogous to one of the arguments reported by Lucretius in the name of Epicurus to show that language could not have come about by convention.<sup>123</sup> It is an argument of *reductio ad absurdum*. Suppose, says Halevi, the chronology is not true, then it must have been invented by somebody. But how was it invented? It could have been invented either by the collusion of many people or by the private invention of one individual. But in the former case, "it would have been impossible even for ten people to have concocted this chronology by a collusion without their having a falling-out and betraying the secret of their collusion."<sup>124</sup> And in the latter case, again, even if only ten people were involved, it would have been impossible that "they should not reject the words of him who would try to impose upon them the belief in such a chronology."<sup>125</sup> Clinching his argument, Halevi con-

<sup>120</sup> *Ibid.* I, 43: ושני העולם מאדם ועד עתה.

<sup>121</sup> *Ibid.* I, 44: אמר הכוזרי: גם זה חסא אם יש אצלכם מנין ברור מבריאית העולם.

<sup>122</sup> *Ibid.* I, 45: אמר החבר: בו אנו מונים ואין בין היהודים מחלוקת מהוורו (אלכזר) ועד כוש.

<sup>123</sup> Cf. above, n. 85.

<sup>124</sup> *Cuzari* I, 48: כי דבר כזה אי אפשר שיסכימו אליו עשרה מבלי שיחבלבלו ויגלו סוד הסכמתם.

<sup>125</sup> *Ibid.*: או ידחו דברי מי שרצה לברר אצלם דבר כזה.



cludes: "How much more was this impossible when so many multitudes of people were involved and when also the period involved was not long enough to admit untruth and fiction."<sup>126</sup>

Having thus established by positive arguments the authenticity of scriptural chronology, he tries to refute the rival chronologies. Of these rival chronologies he mentions two. First, the various Indian chronologies, with their millions of years, and the claim of the Indians of having antiquities and buildings to prove these chronologies.<sup>127</sup> Second, the chronology based upon a book written in Arabic in the 10th century entitled "On the Nabatean Agriculture" and purported to be a translation from the Aramaic of an ancient author, in which reference was made to "ten thousands of years" and to three men, Dewan, Saghrith and Yanboushad, who are supposed to have lived before Adam.<sup>128</sup> Halevi's refutation of these chronologies is like Origen's and Augustine's refutation of the Egyptian chronology.<sup>129</sup> He simply dismisses them as untrustworthy and unreliable.<sup>130</sup>

Maimonides does not discuss the Indian and the Nabatean chronologies in connection with the scriptural chronology. But he has a detailed discussion of the religious beliefs and forms of worship as described in the book "On the Nabatean Agriculture."<sup>131</sup> The views expressed in that work represent, according to him, the views of the Sabians of whom he says that the Indians are remnants<sup>132</sup> and who, he adds, believed that Adam came to Babylon from a place near India.<sup>133</sup> He refers also to a story contained in that book about a tree which stood in Ninveh twelve thousand years.<sup>134</sup> These Sabians are dismissed by him, as the Indians are by Halevi and the Egyptians by Origen and

<sup>126</sup> *Ibid.*: כל שכן המונים רבים, והמנין קרוב אין הכוב והשקר יכול להכנס עליו.

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid.* I, 60.

<sup>128</sup> *Ibid.* I, 61.

<sup>129</sup> Cf. above, nn. 113, 114.

<sup>130</sup> *Cuzari* I, 61.

<sup>131</sup> *Morck Nebukim* III, 29-30.

<sup>132</sup> *Ibid.* III, 29.

<sup>133</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>134</sup> *Ibid.*

Augustine, as unreliable, having "manufactured ridiculous stories, which prove that their authors were very deficient in knowledge and very far removed from philosophy; they certainly were of extreme ignorance."<sup>135</sup>

#### IV. SPINOZA

It is this conception of Scripture common to all religious philosophers, whether Jewish, Christian or Moslem, ever since Philo, that became an object of attack by those who before Spinoza began to nibble at traditional philosophy and by Spinoza himself in his grand assault on it. He attacks this conception of Scripture on every point.

To begin with, he denies that the information contained in the pre-Mosaic account of history, whether the story of creation or the story of mankind, was known to Moses either by revelation or by an inherited continuous tradition. That part of the Pentateuch, according to him, was made up of various contradictory narratives collected at a much later time.<sup>136</sup> Nor is the historical account in the Pentateuch and in the other books of Scripture from Moses on to be considered as contemporary records of eyewitnesses. These too, were made up of various conflicting accounts collected at a much later period.<sup>137</sup> And so even those parts of Scripture which were originally meant to be history should not be accepted as authentic history in every detail. Only the main outline of that history is probably true, and this not because it was written down by eyewitnesses but because they were evidently transmitted in good faith.<sup>138</sup>

Then, he denies that the Law was divinely revealed. He was aware of the various kinds of evidence for the veracity of the Law that were advanced throughout the history of religious philosophy ever since Philo and, drawing directly upon Maimonides' restatement of these kinds of evidence, he proceeds to

<sup>135</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>136</sup> *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, ch. 9 (Op. ed. Gebhardt, III, 130.1-131.11).

<sup>137</sup> *Ibid.*, chs. 8-10.

<sup>138</sup> *Ibid.*, ch. 12 (III, 166.12-21).

discuss them. Like Maimonides, he argues that miracles, even according to Scripture, are no evidence of the truth of revelation and, again, like Maimonides, he points to the fact that the Israelites themselves were not fully convinced by the miracles performed by Moses as to the truth of what he had taught them about God.<sup>139</sup> Unlike Maimonides, however, he does not consider the revelation on Mount Sinai as more convincing evidence, for the story about that revelation, like many other scriptural stories, though "narrated in Scripture as real and were believed to be real, . . . were in fact only symbolical and imaginary."<sup>140</sup> Indeed he is willing to call Scripture "sacred and divine"<sup>141</sup> and "the word of God,"<sup>142</sup> but this only in the sense that any book that teaches morality may be so described,<sup>143</sup> and to prove that it is "sacred and divine" and "the word of God" in this sense, he is willing to accept the argument which alone according to Maimonides proves the divine origin of Scripture, namely, the intrinsic excellency of its teachings.<sup>144</sup> "Wherefore," he says, "the divine origin of Scripture must consist only in its teaching true virtue"<sup>145</sup> and "the certainty of divine revelation can be based only on the wisdom of the doctrine, and not on miracles, that is, on ignorance."<sup>146</sup>

With subtle irony, we shall now try to show, he turns the tables on Maimonides and declares that the miraculous stories of Scripture, including the story of creation, are no more credible than the fables of the Sabians ridiculed by Maimonides himself. Speaking of the traditional belief in the creation of the world, he says: "I fully expect that those who judge things confusedly . . . erroneously ascribe to substances a beginning like that which they see belongs to natural things; for those who are ignorant of the true causes of things confound, everything and

<sup>139</sup> *Ibid.*, ch. 6 (III, 87.9–35); ch. 7 (III, 99.18–20).

<sup>140</sup> *Ibid.*, ch. 6 (III, 92.35–93.8); cf. ch. 1 (III, 19.3 ff.).

<sup>141</sup> *Ibid.*, ch. 12 (III, 160.11).

<sup>142</sup> *Ibid.* (III, 162.31).

<sup>143</sup> *Ibid.* (III, 160.11; 162.31); cf. *Epist.* 43 (IV, 222.10 ff.).

<sup>144</sup> Cf. above, n. 29.

<sup>145</sup> *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, ch. 7 (III, 99.20–21).

<sup>146</sup> *Epist.* 73 (IV, 307.15–17).



without any mental repugnance represent [1] trees speaking like men, or imagine that [2] men are made out of stones as well as begotten from seed, and that [3] all forms can be changed the one into the other."<sup>147</sup>

In this passage, it will be noticed, Spinoza makes three statements as illustrations of human credulity. Let us see what these three statements refer to.

The first statement, that with regard to trees speaking like men, undoubtedly refers to a passage in Maimonides, where, trying to expose the credulity of the Sabians, he mentions their belief in the existence of a "tree which in its roots resembles a human being and lets out a loud sound and utters certain words."<sup>148</sup>

The second statement, that with regard to men being made out of stones as well as begotten from seed, has a twofold reference. First, it refers to the following preaching of John the Baptist: "I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham."<sup>149</sup> Second, it refers to the Greek legend of Deucalion and Pyrrha, according to which stones thrown by Deucalion became men and those thrown by Pyrrha became women.<sup>150</sup>

The third statement, that with regard to substances and forms being changed into one another, has also a twofold reference. First, it refers to the common Jewish and Christian conception of miracles as the change of substances into one another, illustrated in Maimonides, by the story of Moses changing water into blood<sup>151</sup> and in St. Thomas, by the story of Jesus changing water into wine.<sup>152</sup> Second, it refers to the Greek legends about the metamorphosis of men and gods, which is ridiculed by Tatian in his address to the Greeks: "There are legends," he says, "of the metamorphosis of men: with you the gods also are metamorphosed. Rhea becomes a tree; Zeus a dragon, on ac-

<sup>147</sup> *Eth.* I, Prop. 8, Sch. 2.

<sup>148</sup> *Moreh Nebukim* III, 29.

<sup>149</sup> Matt. 3:9.

<sup>150</sup> Ovid, *Metamorphoses* I, 411-413.

<sup>151</sup> *Moreh Nebukim* II, 29.

<sup>152</sup> St. Thomas, 2 *Sent.* 18, 1, 3c.

count of Persophone; the sisters of Phaëthon are changed into poplars, and Leto into a bird of little value."<sup>153</sup> Tatian himself, it is to be remarked, believed in a still greater metamorphosis, namely, the creation of the world out of a formless præexistent matter, which was itself created out of nothing.<sup>154</sup>

This passage, then, is Spinoza's challenge to all religious philosophers who ever since Philo defended their belief in the creation of the world on the ground of the power of God to work miracles. Maimonides' belief in a miraculous creation of the world out of nothing, he seems to argue, rests on no more solid foundation than the belief of the Sabians in a tree speaking like a man, which is ridiculed by Maimonides himself. Similarly Tatian's belief in the miraculous creation of the world out of a præexistent created formless matter, as well as John the Baptist's preaching that men will be raised from stones, and, in general, all the Jewish and Christian stories about the miraculous change of substances into one another, he again seems to argue, are no more credible than the Greek legends about Deucalion and Pyrrha and about the metamorphoses of men and gods, the latter of which are ridiculed by Tatian himself.

<sup>153</sup> *Oratio ad Graecos*, 10.

<sup>154</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.

## A NOTE ON THE PRINCIPLE OF INTENTION IN TANNAITIC LITERATURE

By SOLOMON ZEITLIN

A Mishna in the Tractate Shab. 21 reports the following controversy between the Schools of Shammai and Hillel. בית שמאי אומרים מעבירין (מגביהים) מעל השלחן עצמות וקליפין ובית הלל אומרים מסלק את הטבלא כולה ומנערה. The School of Shammai say: Bones and shells may be taken up from the table (on the Sabbath) and the School of Hillel say: The entire table must be taken and shaken. In the Tosefta the opinions of these two schools are reversed.<sup>1</sup> We cannot assume that this is a scribal error as the same reading is recorded in the Mishna of the *מחנהא דתלמודא דבני מערבא*, ed. W. H. Lowe.

The contradiction between the Mishna and the Tosefta was noticed by the rabbis of the Middle Ages, but they did not clarify which source records the opinions held by the two schools correctly. Rashi apparently was of the opinion that the reading of our Mishna is not the correct one and the opinions of the two schools are to be reversed.<sup>2</sup>

To understand the underlying reasons for the difference between these two schools and also to define which source has the correct version, I shall make the following observations. The difference of opinion between the two schools hinges on the principle of intention.

I pointed out in my article "Studies in Tannaitic Jurisprudence"<sup>3</sup> that the controversy between the schools of Shammai and Hillel, recorded in the first Mishna of Beza, as to whether

<sup>1</sup> בית הלל אומרים מגביהין מעל השלחן עצמות וקליפין ובית שמאי אומרים מסלק את הטבלא כולה ומנערה. (Shab. 143a)

<sup>2</sup> אין אנו כומכין על משנתנו כמות שהיא שנויה אלא מוחלפת שיטתה וב'ש כר' יהודה.

<sup>3</sup> *Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosophy*, Vol. 1, 1919; *idem*, "Asmakta or Intention," *JQR*, Vol. XIX; "Les Dix-Huit Mesures," *REJ*, 68 pp. 22-34.



an egg laid on *Yom-tov* may be eaten on the holiday, in which the School of Shammai decided in the affirmative and the School of Hillel in the negative,<sup>4</sup> is based on the principle of intention. According to the School of Hillel no act was considered valid unless it was intended by the person, while the School of Shammai disregarded intention. Therefore many controversies between these two schools, such as that recorded in the first Mishna of Beza, would be the result of their differences on the principle of intention. According to the Pentateuch any food to be eaten on the Sabbath had to be prepared on the day previous.<sup>5</sup> For this reason in the Hellenistic literature Friday was called *παρασκευή*,<sup>6</sup> Friday was known as the day of preparation. The same principle applied with respect to anything to be eaten on holidays; it had to be prepared the day before. The School of Shammai regarded an egg laid on a holiday as already prepared before and hence permitted it to be eaten on the holiday, while the School of Hillel laying stress on the person's intention or lack of intention prohibited the eating of the egg on the holiday.

We also find the same difference as to the principle of intention in the controversy between Rabbi Judah and Rabbi Simon. We refer to the Mishna Beza 3.4 *בכור שנפל לבור רבי יהודה אומר ירד מומחה ויראה אם יש בו מום יעשה וישחוט ואם לאו לא ישחוט רבי שמעון אומר כל שאין מומו ניכר מבעוד יום אין זה מן המוכן*. If a firstling fell into a pit (on a holiday) Rabbi Judah says: Let an expert go down and look at it; if it has a blemish he may bring it up and slaughter it, otherwise it may not be slaughtered. Rabbi Simon says: If the blemish was not perceived on the day before, it may be regarded as having been prepared (thus it cannot be slaughtered on the holiday). Rabbi Judah, being a Shammaite, held that the owner may slaughter the firstling on the holiday because it has a blemish and was really prepared to be used before the holiday, even though the owner was not aware of the blemish before the holiday. Intention was not a prerequisite.

<sup>4</sup> ביצה שנולדה ביום טוב בית שמאי אומרים תאכל ובית הלל אומרים לא תאכל.

<sup>5</sup> וזהו, Ex. 16.5.

<sup>6</sup> *Ant.* XVI. 6, 2; John 19.14.

<sup>7</sup> See further "Studies in Tannaitic Jurisprudence", pp. 302–308.



the controversy.<sup>11</sup> However the statement in the Mishna is in order and R. Nachman meant to say that R. Judah was a Shammaite and followed the principle of this school, namely that intention of the person is not necessary in the laws of הכנה. R. Simon, on the other hand, was a Hillelite and held that the intention of the person is a *sine qua non* in the laws of הכנה.

In the case where a firstling fell into a pit (on a holiday) Rabbi Judah was of the opinion that if an expert descended into the pit and declared that the firstling had a blemish it might be slaughtered on the holiday since it had incurred the blemish before the holiday and therefore could be slaughtered by an Israelite, although the owner was not aware of the blemish before the holiday. Rabbi Simon maintained that although the animal may have incurred the blemish before the holiday, of which the owner was unaware, it meant he had no intention of slaughtering it. The animal, therefore, may not be slaughtered on the holiday.

Both R. Judah and R. Simon would agree that dogs could be fed with the flesh of a carcass if the animal had died before the Sabbath because, even according to the Hillelites, it would have been מוכן "prepared". R. Judah, who did not take into consideration any intention of a person, would also maintain that if the animal died on the Sabbath one would not be allowed to feed the dogs from the flesh of its carcass since the animal was still alive on the eve of the Sabbath, and could not be considered מוכן "prepared".<sup>12</sup>

The Palestinian Talmud found a contradiction in the words of R. Judah in the above mentioned statement.<sup>13</sup> It was maintained that R. Judah's opinion, as recorded in tractate Beza, must be reversed since it was at variance with his statement as recorded in tractate Shabbat. However, as we have explained, the controversy between these two sages was on the principle of intention. R. Judah was not at variance with his statement

<sup>11</sup> See above note 2.

<sup>12</sup> מחתכין את הדילועין לפני הבהמה ואת הנבלה לפני הכלבים רבי יהודה אומר אם לא <sup>13</sup> היה נבלה מערב שבת אסורה לפי שאינה מן המוכן Shab. 24.4.

מחלפה שיטתיה דר' יהודה דתנינן חמן ר' יהודה אומר אם לא היתה נבלה מערב שבת <sup>13</sup> אסורה לפי שאינו מן המוכן והכא הוא אמר הכי Beza 62a.



in tractate Shabbat and it is unnecessary to reverse his statements.

In conclusion I may say that the Mishna Shab. 21, as recorded in the Babylonian Talmud, is the correct version and that which was before R. Nachman. The controversy was between the Schools of Shammai and Hillel on the principle of intention. The School of Shammai would be לקולא "lenient" while the School of Hillel would be להומרא "strict". The question has already been raised why this controversy was not quoted in the Tractate of Eduyyot where all the קולי בית שמאי והומרי בית הלל are recorded.<sup>14</sup> This may be readily explained. Many controversies between these two schools where the Shammaites were lenient and the Hillelites strict were not recorded in this tractate. The Palestinian Talmud of Ket. 8 remarked that apparently only those controversies where the Shammaites were lenient and the Hillelites strict from every angle were recorded.<sup>15</sup> In our instance the main controversy was: May a person take the bones and shells from the table and feed the dogs, or may he lift the entire board and shake its contents on the floor. In any case the dogs would be fed and the controversy was only regarding the act of the person. Therefore there is no leniency and strictness from every angle.

The version as recorded in the Tosefta<sup>16</sup> and the Palestinian Mishna is faulty. We must assume that this change in the reading was made at a very early period. But why? I believe that this also may be explained. The rabbis in the Talmud as well as the rabbis of the Middle Ages explained that this controversy between the Schools of Shammai and Hillel was not on the principle of הכנה but on the principle of מוקצה.<sup>16</sup> In the latter

<sup>14</sup> Comp. Tosefot Shab. 143a, בית שמאי והומרי קולי בהדי כלי בית שמאי והומרי; בית הלל והיינו כרב נחמן וי"ל דבעריות לא הני לה מקולי בית שמאי; Tosefot Beza 2b, בית הלל והיינו כרב נחמן ומחומרי בית הלל.

<sup>15</sup> ר' פנחס בעא קומי ר' יוסי ולמה לא תניהה מקולי בית שמאי ומחומרי בית הלל אמר ר' לא אחינן מיתני אלא דבר חמור משני צדדין וקל משני צדדין ברם הכא חומר הוא מצד ליה לא אחינן מיתני אלא דבר חמור משני צדדין וקל משני צדדין. אחד וקל מצד אחד Comp. also Yer. Pe'a 6.2. See also Tosefot Ket. 78a

<sup>16</sup> בית הלל אומרים מנביהין מעל השולחן עצמות וקליפין ובית שמאי אומרים מסלק את הטבלה כולה ומנערה.

<sup>16</sup> Comp. Beza 2a, ומאי קושא דילמא בית שמאי, כאי טעמייהו דבית שמאי מוקצה הוא ומאי קושא דילמא בית שמאי מוקצה ליה להו מוקצה. אמר רב נחמן לעולם בהרגנולה העומדת לנדרל בצים ודאית ליה מוקצה

case the Hillelites were always lenient<sup>17</sup> while the Shammaites were strict. Hence the reading was reversed. Furthermore we may assume that since this controversy between the Shammaites and the Hillelites, as recorded in our Mishna, is not found among the מקולי בית שמאי ומחומרי בית הלל in the Tractate Eduyyot, therefore it was thought that our reading was faulty and was changed. But the version of our Mishna is correct and that of the Tosefta and the Palestinian Mishna is faulty.

The controversies between the Schools of Shammai and Hillel as well as those between R. Judah and R. Simon on the principles of הכנה and of מוקצה are very complicated and in many passages of the Talmud the Amoraim made them still more so.

In this note I hope I have shed some light on the Mishna Shab. 21. I am aware that in many passages of the Talmud the reader will find some complications, and even contradictions to my theory. My theory is based *only* on the tannaitic literature, the product of the Tannaim, and it is my belief that the controversies between the two Schools were not fully understood and hence the meanings were confused.<sup>18</sup>

אית ליה נולד ודלית ליה מוקצה לית ליה נולד בית שמאי כרבי שמעון ובית הלל כרבי יהודה ומי אמר רב נחמן הכי והתנן בית שמאי אומרים מנביהין מעל השולחן עצמות וקליפין ובית הלל אומרים מסלק את הטבלא כולה ומנערה ואמר רב נחמן אנו אין לנו אלא בית שמאי כרבי יהודה ובית הלל כרבי שמעון.

<sup>17</sup> Comp. Shab. 45a, . . . דולק שהוא בשעה שזמן שבגר בשעה שהוא דולק . . . אין מוקצה לרבי שמעון אלא שזמן שבגר בשעה שהוא דולק . . . אין מוקצה לרבי שמעון אלא שזמן שבגר בשעה שהוא דולק . . .

<sup>18</sup> In a future study on the history of the tannaitic halaka I hope to shed more light on these principles.

## JOSIPPON: HISTORY AND PIETISM

By ABRAHAM A. NEUMAN

At the summit of Josephus' life, after he had already published his *Wars of the Jews* and the monumental *Antiquities*, Josephus, in one of his final literary utterances, the *Contra Apionem*, pointed proudly to the high place assigned to history and historians in Jewish literary annals. Hebrew historical works, he wrote with pride, were part of sacred scriptures. Prophets and priests were assigned the role of historians. He, Josephus, was a priest.<sup>1</sup>

Little did Josephus realize that with his passing, the art of the Jewish historian, which he rightly extolled, would vanish from among his people for many centuries to come. Supreme egotist that he was, it would still have saddened him to know that his monumental works sealed Jewish historical literature; that his writings were to be the epilogue to national Jewish historiography for a millennium and a half.<sup>2</sup> For although future Jewish generations were destined to create a rich and unique literature—the Mishnah and kindred Tannaitic works, the Talmud in the twin versions of Palestine and Babylonia, the various Midrashim, the Gaonic and subsequent Rabbinic literature, covering a wide variety of theme and content—there was neither prophet nor priest nor lay scribe to continue the tradition of the historian.

References to *Josippon*, indicated by chapter, apply to all the editions following the Constantinople, 1510, edition, excepting the Gotha printing of 1710, edited by Breithaupt, who pursued an arbitrary division of his own design. A numeral preceded by "M" refers to the Günzburg reprint of the Mantua *editio princeps* of 1476-1479, the number referring to the column as in the original edition.

References to Josephus' works are to the Loeb Classics series.

<sup>1</sup> *Contra Apionem* I, 29.

<sup>2</sup> See Neuman, "The Shebet Yehudah and Sixteenth Century Historiography," in *Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume*, pp. 255-57.



With the Temple reduced to ashes, the Jewish state crushed and national independence wiped out, there was no incentive to keep the historian's art alive.<sup>3</sup> This enigmatical turn of national psychology was not and could not have been anticipated by Josephus, the protégé of the Caesars, living in the gilded cage of his country's conquerors. Stranger still, he who wrote so frequently of fate and destiny, and ascribed fatalistic powers to blind Fortune,<sup>4</sup> could not foresee that by a curious combination of obscure factors, a fantastic Hebrew version of his own writings was destined to kindle a limited historic consciousness among his people in all parts of the world. In its dim light, furthermore, his image would be viewed piously by later generations who paid him homage that was bitterly denied him by his own contemporaries.<sup>5</sup>

We refer, of course, to the book of *Josippon*, which was uncritically accepted throughout the Middle Ages as the Hebrew work of the Jewish historian Josephus. It was the strange destiny of this book to fill a gap in the historic consciousness of the Jewish people till the rise of historical Hebrew literature in the sixteenth century.

The book of *Josippon* presents many baffling problems. It was one of the most popular books in Hebrew literature, and its very popularity adds to the perplexity of unraveling its composition and the origin of its parts. It was a folk history book, read by scholars and populace alike. Aside from the Bible it was without rival in Hebrew literature as a narrative book unfolding a great dramatic theme in free, felicitous Hebrew, easily understood by the people.

The universal demand for the book caused it to pass through the hands of numerous scribes who were not always noted for meticulous accuracy in transcription. Scribes in ancient and medieval times were frequently more than literal copyists. They were often men endowed with knowledge and imagi-

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *TB Shab.* 13b.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *B. J.* III, 396; V, 367, 465; VI, 63, 84, 109-10, 249-50, 267-68; VII, 515 *et passim*.

<sup>5</sup> See below.

nation and would, on occasion, embellish the text with their own comments. In copying non-sacred books, in particular, Hebrew copyists would be under no constraint to adhere faithfully to the wording of the text. Among the numerous copyists who were engaged upon the book of *Josippon*, many found the theme peculiarly inviting to additions and embellishments. Thus, fragmentary layers of history, legend and folklore were added anonymously to the original book, or the Ur-text, creating a number of composite texts that vary considerably in length and in the contents of their interpolations.<sup>6</sup> Notwithstanding the keen critical analysis of the text by modern scholars, it is impossible to ascertain with certainty the dimensions of the original work or even to establish the termini of its beginning and end.<sup>7</sup>

In this essay we shall not attempt a new dissection of the text. Nor shall we follow the elusive search in pursuit of its affinities in the Latin Hegesippus and in the later Arabic rendition. Our aim is rather to portray the fictional or pseudo character of *Josippon* and the range of his thoughts as they appeared in final form, rooted in the imagination and the thinking of later generations. We shall treat of the composite literary product as it appeared from the tenth century onward. The *editio princeps* of Mantua, 1476–79, and the Constantinople edition, 1510, from which most of the later printings were copied — both of which are based on a careful scrutiny of numerous manuscripts<sup>8</sup> — will serve as the principal texts for the present

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Introd. to Günzburg edition of *Josippon* by Abraham Kahana, Berdichev, 1896–1913.

<sup>7</sup> See Neubauer, *J. Q. R.* (O. S.) XI, 355 ff.; cf. S. Zeitlin, *Josephus on Jesus*, Philadelphia, 1931.

<sup>8</sup> See Note 6. The Constantinople version is considerably larger than the *editio princeps*. It is amplified partly with obvious interpolations which do not occur in the earlier Mantua edition. These additions, in some cases, are fanciful or incongruous passages that mar the credibility of what appears otherwise as authentic history, and were deliberately omitted by the earlier editor. But in many instances the amplifications are genuine and are of an emotional, dramatic and poetic nature which appealed strongly to the imagination and the emotionalism of its Hebrew readers. Textually, therefore, the Mantua edition is more restrained and may be closer to the original text;

study. An examination of some of the chief characteristics of *Josippon*, a comparison of the narration with the authentic Josephus and a focusing upon its own leitmotifs, should prove doubly rewarding. It will reveal the intellectual and spiritual atmosphere of the medieval Jewish community which accepted the Hebrew *Josippon* as an authentic work and derived inspiration from it. It may also shed light upon the origin of *Josippon* by mapping a chart of its ideas and spiritual concepts.

In the Constantinople edition and all its derivatives, *Josippon* is supposedly divided by the author into six books which were later subdivided by the editor into ninety-seven chapters.<sup>9</sup> Josippon asserts his authorship and identity early in the work: "I am Joseph ha-Kohen, son of Gorion, whom Titus and Vespasian exiled from Jerusalem." He refers to a book called *Josephus*, which he wrote for the Romans. He then proceeds: "And behold this Book, I, Joseph, son of Gorion the priest have written for Israel. The narratives in it I have related. I expounded there the tribes, the nations, and the countries mentioned therein. This is the first section, or Book I.

"I followed this with Book II, which I began with an account of the reign of Alexander, son of Philip of Macedonia and גביראש.<sup>10</sup> Thus I speak of his birth, his wisdom, his heroism and all his experiences with the kings of the earth; also all the events that happened to the people of our God during his lifetime. In Book III, I deal with the events following upon the death of Alexander when his kingdom was partitioned and Antipater, his general, ruled over Parthia as his successor. I included also all that happened to our ancestors, the holy nation, at the hands of the Roman rulers, the Greek kings and the kings of the other nations

but, as a mirror of the feelings of the medieval Jewish community, the later edition is decidedly to be preferred. Virtually all subsequent republications of *Josippon* followed the text of the Constantinople edition, with the exception of the Basel edition of 1541, which has a Latin translation and preface by Sebastian Münster. Only one reprinting of the Mantua edition was published in recent years: ed. Günzburg, Berditschev, 1896-1913.

<sup>9</sup> *Josip.*, Ch. 3; cf. Ch. 82.

<sup>10</sup> In the Alexander Romance narrative in *Josip.*, Ch. 6, the mother of Alexander (Olympies) is called גביראש.



as well as the Jewish kings, from the time of the above-mentioned Antipater (and the other kings who succeeded Alexander upon the division of his kingdom) to the reign of the Hasmonean priests.

"In Book IV, I treated of the events that happened to our ancestors at the hands of the Roman and Greek kings and the rulers of other nations, from the beginning of the Hasmonean dynasty to the end of the reign of Alexandra, the wife of Alexander, son of Hyrcanus.

"In Book V, I dealt with the history of our ancestors from the death of Alexandra, through the reigns of her sons Hyrcanus and Aristobulus till the coming of my own period, when I and my associates were to fight the wars of the Lord and the end arrived, the time for the unhappy disastrous exile in the days of King Agrippa. And that which I witnessed in my time, and to which I bear testimony, I, having fought the wars of the Lord with all my power, I have put down in Book V.

"The sixth Book is called *Josippon* in Hebrew (יהודית); also *The Wars of the Lord*. In Greek it is called *Joseppus* and in the language of the Romans, *Josephus*, for this is my name among them. Indeed this Book is called by the name *Josippon* which is also the name for the entire work. What I have narrated therein I have witnessed and testified to in person. And that which I wrote in the earlier books I have drawn from reliable writers such as Nicolaus the Roman chronicler from Damascus, whom I have known, Strabo of Cyprus, Titus the Roman chronicler, Togatos of Jerusalem, Porphyrius, Polybius the Roman, and many other writers.<sup>10</sup> I also drew upon the traditions of many generations of my saintly fathers, high-priests and scribes, teachers of the Torah.

"Verily all the six Books I composed in the Hebrew language and all of them are the writing of Joseph the priest, son of Gorion, and all six are comprised under the name *Josippon*."

The most personalized part of the long History is comprised in what is here called Book VI. In theme it corresponds roughly to Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum*, and the two accounts run parallel to each other. In both, the author plays also the stellar role

<sup>10</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, Ch. 6 (beginning).

of actor and commentator. A comparison of the two narratives reveals strikingly the contrast between the candid self-portrayal of Josephus and his imaginary counterpart created in the image of an early Jewish pietist. The former portrait was drawn according to Roman taste which later proved also pleasing to the Church. The latter etching, drawn on Hebrew canvas by an anonymous writer, was engraved with Jewish features that expressed more faithfully the agony of a Jewish soul that witnessed the doom of his people and the ascension in flames of God's sanctuary in the Holy City.

For the purposes of the present study our attention will be principally focused on the two parallel accounts: the so-called *Wars of the Lord* in *Josippon* and the *Wars of the Jews* by Josephus. Josephus' narrative in Greek was, from a Jewish viewpoint, cold, detached, defeatist, frequently revealing a pro-Roman and anti-Jewish bias. The Hebrew *Josippon*, on the other hand, was intensely and proudly Jewish. Casting no blame upon the Romans and sorrowing deeply for the shortcomings and the sins of his people which provoked God's wrath upon the nation, Josippon tearfully and prayerfully looks up to God. For He who decreed the chastisement of His people will in the end lead them to redemption.<sup>11</sup> These contrasting viewpoints are reflected in the titles of the two books. Josephus called his history, *Concerning the Jewish War*, which the Church, to suit its theological position, changed to read *Concerning the Jewish Captivity*. In the Hebrew version an anonymous author gave it the prophetic title, *The Wars of the Lord*, to inspire later generations with the belief that Israel was continually waging the wars of the Lord which could have but one ultimate end: religious triumph and moral vindication. This was actually the conviction that steered Jewish hearts throughout the exile.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>11</sup> See Ch. 65, end: ויהיה לפליטה ולשאריה מישאל עד הגיע זמן בנין הבית פעם ג' ואשרי המהכה ויגיע לראות בטוב ה' ולחיות בנועם חסדו אשר יהיה לישראל בימים ההם. ועתה אנחנו בהיותנו כואבים בצרותינו ואח נרפא מחץ כאבנו ושבר לבנו כי נזכור גדולות החשועה ההיא ונשמח ונשיש כי נחשוב בה מה יעשו הרואים את כבודה אשר עין בעין יראו בשוב ה' את שיבת ציון וירושלים ונשכחו הצרות הראשונות העוברות ואלה לא יזכרו ולא יפקדו ולא יעלו על לב.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Tam b. David ibn Yahya's, Introduction to *Josippon*.

The autobiographical accounts in *Josephus* and *Josippon* are parallel in many respects and yet also strangely divergent. Josippon is represented as being Josephus himself, the descendant of an aristocratic priestly family, the intrepid commander-in-chief in Galilee, the honored prisoner of Vespasian, the counselor of Titus, the protégé of the Caesars in the Roman palace. But throughout the book of *Josippon* he calls himself repeatedly Joseph, the son of Gorion, instead of Matthias, who was the father of Josephus. There appears to be no satisfactory explanation for this puzzle.<sup>13</sup> Other family references scattered in various parts of *Josippon*, which seem bizarre and contradictory, may be ascribed to confused, clumsy interpolations, for they do not occur in the earlier Mantua edition. Thus, according to the Constantinople version, Josippon was born fifty-one years before Julius Caesar (sic) and he was sixty-seven years old at the siege of Jerusalem!<sup>14</sup> That both parents were alive during the siege and imprisoned by the revolutionary leaders in Jerusalem is attested in the two accounts, which run parallel;<sup>15</sup> but Josippon adds that his father was then 103 years old and his mother 85.<sup>16</sup> Josippon was the eldest of eighteen children and was the lone survivor of them all according to his mother's pathetic account.<sup>16</sup> In another passage, a brother Bonin comes to life.<sup>17</sup> No reference to the former occurs in any of Josephus' writings, while in his *Life* mention is made in a different connection of a brother by the name of Matthias.<sup>17a</sup>

Maritally, the accounts of *Josephus* and *Josippon* do not

<sup>13</sup> Abraham Zacuto who made use of *Josephus* as well as *Josippon* (see note 88 below) tried to solve the puzzle of Joseph's paternity by suggesting that the name of the father of Joseph b. Gorion was Mattathias. He must have assumed that Gorion was a patronymic.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., Chs. 15: ובשנת קל"ד לאיכפראוס נולדתי אני יוסף הכהן בן נוריון הכהן ואני הוא יוסף הנקרא יוסיפוס היהודי אשר הסיפור עליו בעולם כי כתב ספר מלחמות ה' והוא החלק הששי מזה הספר ובחלק ההוא והוא הספר הששי הראה עוד עדותי על זה נאמנה. See Ch. 85.

<sup>14a</sup> Cf. B. J. V, 533, 544: *Josip.*, Chs. 85, 90.

<sup>15</sup> *Josip.*, Ch. 90.

<sup>16</sup> Idem.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., Ch. 95.

<sup>17a</sup> *Life*, §§ 8, 75.



agree with each other. Josephus was at least thrice married — a fourth marriage is implied — had three children by one wife, and two sons by his last spouse.<sup>18</sup> Josippon speaks of but one wife, the dearly beloved wife of his youth, of noble descent, who was precious to him even though she bore him no children.<sup>19</sup> This "beloved wife of his youth" may indeed be the first wife of Josephus to whom an unnamed reference is made in the parallel passage in *The Wars of the Jews*. In any event, however, Josippon did not allude to any of the wives that dot the pages of Josephus' *Life*. Evidently the author of *Josippon* knew not the *Life* of Joseph son of Matthias, even though he was at home in the highways and byways of *The Wars of the Jews* and followed their paths in the *Wars of the Lord*.

Puzzling as these points may be, they are comparatively irrelevant and immaterial in relation to the emergence of two contrasting personalities that engage our attention. The historical Josephus basked in the favor of the Caesars. He was still a young man in the prime of life when his nation was crushed, and he lived the greater part of his life in the luxury of a Roman palace.<sup>19a</sup> Indeed the most effective part of his life, the period of literary creativeness, was spent there in ease and comfort, thanks to the benevolence of his royal patrons, they who had amused themselves by throwing countless thousands of his countrymen to a cruel death in the gladiatorial arenas. In the case of Josippon, the curtain falls as he hovers over the ruins of Jerusalem, breaks forth into a heart-rending dirge and in the midst of desolation and despair looks with hope to the distant horizon.

Josephus' works were honored in Rome and highly esteemed by the Church, which preserved them for posterity in the Greek original and in Latin translation. For the Synagogue they were non-existent.<sup>20</sup> It may be properly argued that this did not

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., §§ 1, 75, 76; *B. J. V.*, 419.

<sup>19</sup> *Josip.*, Ch. 85.

<sup>19a</sup> *Life*, §§ 76. Cf. Eusebius, *Eccles. Hist.* 3, 10.

<sup>20</sup> The hypothetical identification of Josephus with Joseph ha-Kohen, mentioned in *Hallah* IV, 11 and *Moed Katan* 23a, cannot be taken seriously. The biographical data in these passages preclude such identification.

betray conscious hostility on the part of the Synagogue. For even so Jewish a work as I Maccabees, written in Hebrew with fervent patriotic spirit, was soon lost to Judaism, apparently by default. But it is significant, nevertheless, that Josephus, who was a target of Rabban Simon b. Gamaliel's suspicion and distrust,<sup>21</sup> and who was also a contemporary of Rabban Johanan b. Zaccai and the other rabbis who strove heroically to preserve Judaism after the shock of the destruction of the Temple, should have been so completely ignored by them as to leave no trace of his name in the writings of that period.

In this instance, however, the vacuum created by the silence of the rabbis was compensated for later by a popular rendition of the lost *Josephus* in which imagination was given free rein and the Roman-tinted facts of history were transformed into themes for Hebraic moral-religious teachings. Inevitably, the author too took on the character and personality that suited the mood of his theme. Whereas Josephus adopted Vespasian's family name Flavius, his alter ego became the son of Gorion, who was himself one of the Jewish generals in the war against the Romans and in supreme control in Jerusalem at the outbreak of the revolt!

In the opening chapter of the *Wars*, Josephus defends his feeling of grief at the calamity that befell his nation and his country — "indeed, in my opinion, the misfortunes of all nations since the world began fall short of those of the Jews." He pleads with his critics for their indulgence "for a compassion which falls outside an historian's province." He adds: "should, however, any critic be too austere for pity, let him credit the history with the facts, the historian with the lamentations."<sup>22</sup>

In the light of his own subsequent narrative one may well wonder why such defense was at all necessary. But assuming that his grief was genuine and deep, he held forth no hope, no ray of light, to his stricken brethren mourning over the ruins of the Temple or dispersed as exiles throughout the Roman Empire. With studied silence he seemed to deny the future

<sup>21</sup> *Life*, 38-39, 60.

<sup>22</sup> *B. J. I*, 12.

restoration of his people to nationhood and independence. In craven fear of the Romans, he suppressed the Messianic hope, and not even a prayer for the restoration of the Temple crossed his lips.<sup>22a</sup>

As a prologue to the *Wars of the Lord*, on the other hand, Josippon or his amanuensis, a glossator, writes: "My heart trembles as I am now about to recite the destruction of our holy Temple which we have seen built and destroyed — yea, its visitation has come, its perplexity is now at hand. With my eyes, I beheld the wars of God against the adversaries who oppressed us; God having aroused their spirit in order to wreak vengeance upon us for the desecration of His Law. We have named this book *The Wars of the Lord*.

"Would that the grace of God permitted me to behold the Temple rebuilt once again! But the order of nature will not be altered. How indeed can I hope to have my days prolonged till Israel will once more through penitence be restored to happiness and prosperity in its own land? I do not merit such grace, for I am sinful. But we shall declare happy the generation that will escape and be among the remnant of Israel when the time will come for the Temple to be built for the third time. Happy he who waiteth and liveth to see the goodness of the Lord and to behold the loveliness of His grace which will be manifest in Israel in those days."<sup>23</sup>

Filled with faith in God's covenant with Israel through eternity, he exclaims: "Therefore be ye greatly comforted who witness this day our distress. For the time will come when your sons will yet rule over this land. And they who hear of our present suffering may indeed take comfort, for this is the last affliction that will be visited upon Israel and no other sorrow will come to the people of God thereafter."<sup>24</sup>

Whether the Hebrew writer of *Josippon* had before him the Greek original of Josephus' *Wars* or a loose Latin translation<sup>25</sup>

<sup>22a</sup> Cf. F. J. Foakes Jackson, *Josephus and the Jews*, pp. 72-3, 83-5, 90.

<sup>23</sup> *Josip.*, Ch. 65, end.

<sup>24</sup> Idem.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Zunz, *Die Gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden*, pp. 154 ff.



may well depend on whether his domicile was located in Palestine, the Byzantine empire or Italy. Even an original version in Aramaic, although highly unlikely, is not altogether precluded, if we adopt a sufficiently early dating for *Josippon*. However conjectural these issues may be, certain facts stand out clearly. Josippon's narrative follows the account in *Josephus* closely, page after page, sentence after sentence.<sup>26</sup> Major events and minor incidents, obscure geographical names and unfamiliar Graeco-Roman names are repeated in *Josippon* in identical sequence, though the spelling of strange nomenclature frequently appears obviously corrupted in the Hebrew.<sup>27</sup> But what is equally clear and at times more significant are the lapses between the two accounts, the omission of highly pertinent details in *Josippon*. Thus all references to Josephus' claims to prophecy are studiously avoided in *Josippon*. We do not hear of his nightly dreams in which God spoke to him of the impending fate of the Jews and of the destinies of the Roman sovereigns. Josippon does not represent himself as "an interpreter of dreams and skilled in divining the meaning of ambiguous utterances of the

<sup>26</sup> *Josippon's* occasional departures from the original *Josephus* are striking and unexplainable. Thus, according to the Hebrew version in the Constantinople edition, Vespasian, upon the advice of his Counselors, brought Josippon, chained as a prisoner, under protective custody with him to Rome, where he witnessed the coronation. Also Agrippa and his son Monobaz were in Vespasian's retinue. Subsequently, Agrippa and his son were executed for treason (sic) while Josippon, who enjoyed the favor and confidence of Vespasian, was set free and sent back to Titus to serve him as trusted adviser and fatherly counselor. In this story is interwoven the description of Vespasian's coronation ceremony, which is generally conceded to be an anachronism and a late interpolation dating from the tenth century.

The Mantua edition entirely omits this chapter and faithfully follows the historic account in *Josephus*.

<sup>27</sup> A curious geographical transformation in *Josippon* is Goshen, Egypt, for Gophna, a small town near Jerusalem. Compare *B. J.* VI, 115 with *Josip.*, Ch. 92, M 510. The confusion of Menahem b. Saruk for Mannaëus son of Lazarus, a gatekeeper in Jerusalem, who gave an account of the corpses carried out of his gate from May 1 to July 20, in 70 c. e., is peculiar to the Constantinople edition and its derivatives. The Mantua edition does not name the keeper but calls the gate, "the gate of Menahem." On the other hand, the figures cited (M 498 = 115,000, Const. ed. Ch. 91 = 115,808; *B. J.* V, 567 = 115,880) reveal the interdependence of the various texts.

Deity." To Josippon it would no doubt have appeared blasphemous to make such claims and with such pretensions to address God in the words of Josephus: "Since it pleases Thee who didst create the Jewish nation, to break Thy work, since fortune has wholly passed to the Romans, and since Thou hast made choice of my spirit to announce the things that are to come, I willingly surrender to the Romans and consent to live; but I take Thee to witness that I go, not as a traitor but as Thy minister."<sup>28</sup>

At this critical passage in the life-story of Josephus, he is summoned by his Jewish companions in the cave to take his own life in preference to surrender to the Romans. By means of a desperate stratagem he succeeds in saving his life by proposing a pact of self-immolation to be determined by the casting of lots, but the Hebrew writer frankly calls it a ruse (מרמה, תחבולה) and does not hypocritically ascribe the outcome to the intervention of Fortune or the providence of God.<sup>29</sup>

Josephus dramatized his interview with Vespasian as he appeared ostensibly as a captive, till he revealed himself the messenger of God. "You imagine, Vespasian, that in the person of Josephus you have taken a mere captive; but I come to you as a messenger of greater destinies. Had I not been sent on this errand by God, I knew the Laws of the Jews and how it becomes a general to die. To Nero do you send me? . . . . . You will be Caesar, Vespasian, you will be Emperor, you and your son here. . . . . You, Caesar, are master not of me only, but of land and sea and the whole human race." The skeptical doubts of the Romans, he continued, were dissipated when upon investigation, it was found that he had proved "a truthful prophet in other matters." This phase is completely eliminated in the Hebrew version of *Josippon*, which in all other respects reproduces the setting fully and faithfully.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>28</sup> B. J. III, 351-54; cf. *ibid.*, 399-408.

<sup>29</sup> *Josip.*, Ch. 72, end: יוסף היה נבחר ממנו ונס יוסף כי ירא ממנו פן ימיתו: ועתה אמר ריע יוסף כדברים האלה ליוסף כי ירא ממנו ונס יוסף היה נבחר ממנו וגם הוא בחרו אליו לבן וזו בלתי בעל נבורה בתחבולה ובמרמה למען יהיה מתגבר הוא עליו ובוה רב שכל יוסף מדעתו כי נמלט מחרב הפתאים הרשעים ההם וממלט מחרב רעהו ולא נשחתה נפשו; M. 414.

<sup>30</sup> B. J. III, 399-408.

It may seem inconsistent for a "prophet" to boast of his military prowess and worldly self-esteem; but Josephus had no such misgivings. Vespasian, he tells us, "considered that the issue of the war depended largely on his (Josephus') capture."<sup>31</sup> His Jewish companions in the cave, threatening him with death still held the general in reverence. "Sweeter to them than life was the thought of death with Josephus."<sup>32</sup>

In the Hebrew version, Josippon, though no prophet, is also accorded exalted rank, but this is treated with spiritual sensitivity in harmony with Jewish feeling and tradition. In the same setting as in Josephus, Josippon's companions in the cave upbraid him for his willingness to surrender: "We are astonished at thee, oh Prince Joseph! For thou wast chosen from the multitude of thy people for priesthood and kingship before the Holy One, the Lord, God of Israel, and thou hast been appointed a supreme commander at the head of thy nation. And now that thine eyes behold the reproach of thy people and the ruin of thy flock dost thou still desire to cling to life? What hath life to offer? Better is death than life now . . . .

"The Sacred Torah is enshrined in thy heart. Thou art annointed. Thou art a priest. Thou hast taught and expounded the holy Torah so that we may know how to love the Lord our God with all our heart and all our soul and all our might. And if this doth not mean that we serve Him and love that which He loveth and that we die for His covenant, His Torah and His Sanctuary, what can it mean?"<sup>33</sup>

Although Josephus and his shadow Josippon are thus sharply contrasted, their narratives agree not only in fact but in the historic and moral interpretation of the events they record. The rebels are held up not as heroes but villains. That they were patriots to whom tyranny was hateful beyond endurance and liberty more precious than life; that they were religious visionaries and fanatics who set the kingdom of God above the powers of almighty Rome is indicated grudgingly and held up

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., III, 340.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., III, 390.

<sup>33</sup> *Josip.*, Ch. 71, M 406-9.



to scorn as arrogance and foolhardiness by Josephus;<sup>34</sup> and Josippon too follows in the same vein, deploring the unfortunate militant intransigence, although, it must be said, with a sorrow greater than bitterness. The ringleaders are made to bear sole responsibility for the war and its terrible consequences. The Romans acted in defense of their legitimate sovereign rights. Time and again Vespasian and later Titus offered the leaders of the rebellion honorable terms. They did not seek to destroy the land or the people. They had deep reverence for the Sanctuary of the God of Israel. The Jewish nation, its responsible heads, the elders and the priests, the Pharisees and the nation at large desired peace with honor. They were content to live under Roman rule as long as their religious beliefs and practices were not interfered with. They did not provoke the war initially and were ready to negotiate peace terms with the Romans during the course of the rebellion. It was the wicked malcontents who were the incendiaries. They inflamed the youth, instigated the revolt and ruthlessly suppressed and crushed any and all attempts to bring about peace.<sup>35</sup> Thus we read in *Josippon*: "When I fought against the Romans in Galilee, I knew that in the end I would yield to them. But I was helpless to take action for the brigands at my side were denouncing me, and I feared lest they attack and kill me if I considered surrender and submission to the Romans."<sup>36</sup>

Political freedom, national sovereignty, had no lure or glamor for Josippon. He professed alternately, sorrow, pity and indignation at those who were inspired by the hope and dream of liberty to give their lives in its cause and to place in jeopardy all they held dear, their beloved ones, their nation, and most precious of all, the national shrine, the Sanctuary of the God of Israel. Jewish history, he convinced himself, set no high value on national independence. "Brethren and friends," he declaimed before the fighters on the ramparts of Jerusalem, at a discreet distance: "You declare we would all rather die

<sup>34</sup> Cf. *B. J.* II, 539; III, 120, 256-57; V, 343, 365, 401 ff., 458-59; VI, 99-102, 566, *et passim*.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. *Josip.*, Chs. 75, 82, 84, 85, M 457-58, 464, 471-72.

<sup>36</sup> *Josip.*, Ch. 84; Cf. M 471.

as one than serve foreign kings; that death is more to be desired than life to escape this evil and the sight of our Sanctuary in ruins. Inquire then of your fathers of old, when were you free and sovereign without overlords and the yoke of other nations?" Reviewing their history from this slant, Josippon recalled that the Jews served many nations for long periods, to wit, Egypt, Assyria, Persia, Chaldea; and they fought in the wars of other nations. At times they met with defeat; at times they also gained victories. In the light of this historic record, wherein lies the shame or humiliation in submitting now to the Romans, the great world conquerors?<sup>37</sup>

And yet both Josephus' and Josippon's accounts allow that despite the overwhelming power of Rome and the enormous superiority of Roman armies, the revolt might have succeeded if not for the fatal dissension within the Jewish ranks of the warriors. The deficiency of the Jews in military equipment and experience was overbalanced by their tenacity, passion and fanatical courage. Roman military science and strategy were outmatched by Jewish daring, intrepidity and resourcefulness. The battle-scarred veterans of many hard-fought campaigns retreated before the impetuous, reckless fury of the fighters of Israel. The Romans fought for honor; the Jews battled for country, for God and liberty. But all their bravery, sacrifices and bloodshed were for naught because of factionalism and fratricide within the ranks of the defenders of Jerusalem. Lust for power and jealousy blinded the fierce leaders of the revolt.<sup>38</sup>

The charges against the "men of violence" are identical in the accounts of Josephus and Josippon, but the latter's indictment appears if anything blacker and gloomier because of the more emotional tone of his recital. All the enormities of fiendish crime and violence were perpetrated by the brigand chieftains who wrested the control of Jerusalem. The streets of the holy city flowed with innocent blood. First in the line of victims were the nobles and the priests, men of holiness and apostles

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., M 459 ff.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. *B. J.* III, 472-84; V, 257; VI, 34-35; *Josip.* Chs. 68, 69, 70, 74, 82, etc.; M 447, 470: כל הרעה אשר באתנו מימי עולם מידנו היהנו בנו.

of peace. But a reign of general terror followed. Suspicion and jealousy were rife among the insurrectionists. Fierce warfare broke out among them. Jerusalem was converted into a series of bristling camps of hostile forces. The sacred precincts of the Temple were trampled upon and violated by men of violence. The altar of God was defiled by the slain bodies of the priests and the corpses of other victims heaped upon it. All the evils of bitter civil war were visited upon the inhabitants: murder, rapine, loot, famine.<sup>39</sup>

Blind was the faith of those who put their trust in the inviolability of the City of God and its Sanctuary. For God had turned His face from the city of pollution. Jerusalem was doomed. God was on the side of the Roman legions. Rome was the instrument of God's will.<sup>40</sup>

To Josephus this represented the turn of the wheel of Fortune. For God "went the rounds of the nations bringing to each in turn the rod of empire and this now rested over Italy."<sup>41</sup> Josippon raised this thought to a higher level. He assumed that the Jews might well believe that though God had given dominion over the world to the Romans, He had reserved one people as His peculiar treasure and nation, the people of Israel. But he cried out to the men of Jerusalem: "Are you not covered with shame? You are indeed children of the people of God and His peculiar treasure, but alas, your iniquities have separated you from your God."<sup>42</sup>

Josippon cried out against leaving the arbitrament of the Jews' cause to force of arms. There is a greater ring of sincerity in the Hebrew version than in the parallel wording of Josephus — "Ye rebellious sons, declare now: have your fathers ever prevailed over their enemies by the sword, the spear, and warfare? Was it not through prayer, penitence, and the good and upright heart in the service of the Lord that God came to their

<sup>39</sup> *Josip.*, Chs. 75, 77, 79, 80, etc.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. *B. J.* IV, 318; V, 19, 559; VI, 99, 110, 411; *Josip.*, Ch. 84: הנה סר צל ד' מעליכם כי חטאתם לו ומעלכם בהיכלו ובכהניו.

<sup>41</sup> *B. J.* V, 367.

<sup>42</sup> *Josip.*, Ch. 84: הלא חבשו וחקלמו באמרכם זה וחחרו בקלון וחרפה . . . ואף כי אתם בני עם ה' ומגולחו . . . ועוונותיכם מבדילים ביניכם לבין אלהיכם.



aid? . . . . Who does not know that prayer is more effective than weapons of war for prayer hastens the help of God and His salvation?"<sup>43</sup>

Citing the heroes of the Bible — the patriarchs, judges, kings and prophets — he illustrated through their vicissitudes that it was by means of prayer that "our fathers have always prevailed . . . . Whatever evil has come upon us in our long history has been our own doing. Our enemies never injured us as much as we hurt ourselves."<sup>44</sup>

These reflections were in harmony with the prophetic tradition of Israel and with the depressed condition of the Jews in the centuries of exile after the calamitous war. But what is particularly striking and revealing is the portrayal of Titus in *Josippon*, so similar to, even though also different from that of *Josephus*.

In the *Wars* of Josephus, Titus is the heroic figure who fills the center of the stage. Josephus glories in Titus' exploits and deeds of valor as if Titus were fighting the cause of the Jewish people.<sup>45</sup> The adulation of Titus extends to his associates, including the renegade Jew Tiberius Alexander.<sup>46</sup> When Titus sanctioned the crucifixion of countless hopeless victims, driven by famine out of the besieged city — "so great was their number that space could not be found for the crosses nor crosses for the bodies" — Josephus condoned the act as a war measure.<sup>47</sup> He rationalized his unnatural sympathies by asserting that the destroyers of Jerusalem were the foes within, "doing all that their besiegers could have desired . . . "For I maintain that it was the sedition that subdued the city, and the Romans the sedition, a foe far more stubborn than her walls; and that all

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., Ch. 85, M 464-64, 466-67

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., M 470, Ch. 85: ומי לא ידע אשר התפלה נכבדת מכל כלי המלחמה כי התפלה . . . החיש עזרת ה' וישועתו . . . וכל הרעה אשר באה אלינו מימינו מעולם וטראש מירינו באה אלינו כי צדיק הוא ה' אלהינו על כל מעשיו אשר עשה עמנו. ולא הרעו אויבים לנו כאשר הרענו אנחנו לנפשותינו.

<sup>45</sup> B. J. I, 27-29, III, 324-485 ff., IV, 70 ff., V, 54-66, 81-97, VI, 486 ff., etc.

<sup>46</sup> B. J. V, 45-46. Cf. V, 97, 310 ff.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., V, 449 ff.

the tragedy of it may properly be ascribed to her own people, all the justice to the Romans."<sup>48</sup>

Titus appears throughout as the would-be savior of Jerusalem, the Temple and the Jewish people.<sup>49</sup> He is filled with compassion for the suffering population.<sup>50</sup> He stands in awe and reverence of the holiness of the Temple.<sup>51</sup> In turn, he lives under the special protection of the Deity.<sup>52</sup> He owes much to the favors of Fortune.<sup>53</sup> The very springs around Jerusalem which had dried up flowed copiously for Titus.<sup>54</sup> In the midst of the holocaust, as the Temple was burning in flames, Titus, peering into the Holy of Holies and desperately striving to save the Temple from the doom of fire, still dominates the scene.<sup>55</sup> And when the tragedy is over and a ghastly silence settles over the ashes of the Temple and the ruins of Jerusalem, the Jewish historian does not drop his pen or raise his voice in lamentation. He marches on with his idol through lavish feasts and banquets at which the chief entertainment was furnished by Jewish captives thrown to the wild beasts or compelled in opposing masses to fight each other to death.<sup>56</sup> Thus he continues to plot the progress of the conquering hero on his triumphal march to Rome. The significance of the spectacle presented by the triumphal procession in Rome, the colorful pageants re-enacting the devastating war scenes, the flaunting exhibition of a captured scroll of the Law and the sacred vessels taken from the Temple in Jerusalem, the public execution of the last surviving rebel leader, all these are paeans of glory to the illustrious career of Flavius Titus.<sup>57</sup>

The portrayal of Titus in *Josippon* seems like a faithful replica of Josephus' original, but the effect is different. Without

<sup>48</sup> Ibid., V, 257.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., VI, 128, 236 ff., 249, 251, 254-66.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., V, 519, VI, 130.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., V, 241; VI, 94 ff.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., V, 60-61; VI, 411.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., V, 88, 409; VI, 57, 413.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid., V, 409.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid., V, 254-80.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., VII, 24, 37-40.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., VII, 132-157.

reducing the stature of Titus or altering the character features as they are depicted in *Josephus*, the Hebrew writer changed the perspective and thus created a subtly different mood. Not Titus and his exploits but the relentless tragedy of Israel is the focusing point around which the theme of *Josippon* is centered. That the Siloam and other springs around Jerusalem started to flow, benefiting the enemy, is recorded as an unhappy fact, not a Titus miracle. The Hebrew writer believing solely in the providence of God allows no play for the whims and caprices of Fortune. Thus Titus loses the charm which Fortune cast over his life in Josephus' portrayal.

At a critical moment, when Titus barely saved himself by cutting through the cordon of Jewish soldiers who surrounded him, Josippon accounts for this narrow escape not by assuming a charmed existence for Titus but by the prosaic explanation that the assailants desired above all to capture him alive.<sup>58</sup> With the moral faith of a Hebrew, he believed that God helped to preserve Titus in order to surrender Jerusalem to him in expiation of the sins of the Jews. It was Titus the pagan who then perceived that "the hearts of kings are in the hands of God."<sup>59</sup>

These changes in perspective and viewpoint reflect the outlook of the Hebrew author of *Josippon*; but they did not alter in any essential degree his character portrayal of Titus from its prototype in *Josephus*. For Josippon too viewed Titus as one who did not seek the destruction of his Jewish subjects. "For he had compassion on Jerusalem, the Temple of God and the people of God". . . . "When he saw that the Jews were ready to sacrifice their lives and to die as one man in combat, for they preferred to die rather than live, he pleaded with them and entreated them to make peace."<sup>60</sup> He was distressed because the rebels were obdurate and had no regard or pity for their own lives or the lives of their wives, sons and daughters. When Titus saw the terrible and gruesome casualties resulting from the famine that he had imposed upon the inhabitants of the

<sup>58</sup> *Josip.*, Ch. 81, M 439.

<sup>59</sup> *Idem.*

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, Ch. 84, M 455-56.

besieged city, "when he beheld the corpses of those who died of hunger thrown into the Kedron valley as dung upon the field, he trembled exceedingly and raising his hands to heaven exclaimed: 'O God of heaven and earth, Thou in whom the people of Israel believe, render me innocent of this guilt, for I did not desire to bring this about. I cried unto them for peace but they would not have it, and they brought on this evil.'"<sup>61</sup>

With Josippon acting as interpreter, Titus challenges John the rebel chief to leave the precincts of the Temple and to fight the battle in the open. "Wherefore do you make war from the sacred altar and profane the Lord your God and His Sanctuary? We do not mean to wage war against the Temple, for it is the house of the great God. Our battle is with you and not with the Temple." But John replied: "We have no better sacrifice to offer upon the altar than our own flesh and blood, for we shall battle and die for our God and we shall be acceptable unto Him as a continual burnt-offering. As free men we shall give up our lives in the Sanctuary."<sup>62</sup>

As the siege was nearing its climax, Titus, with Josippon at his side, again and again with mounting intensity pleads with the rebels to come to terms. He offers them a covenant "in the presence of the God of this sanctuary." With God as his witness he swears that he will not break his covenant, that he will not requite them evil, that he will not take loot or lead them into captivity, but he will set a king over them from one of their own notables. If they willed it — according to one version — he would appoint Joseph the priest (Josippon) over them as king. He would set free the men of faith who were with him and they would return to their land and every man would freely eat of

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., Ch. 88, M 482. Cf. *ibid.*, Ch. 91.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., Ch. 92, M 507-8: "וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל יוֹחָנָן הַפְּרִיץ מִה חָטָא לָךְ הַהִיכַל הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר תִּנְרָה עָלָיו אֶת הָרָעָה הַגְּדוֹלָה לְהוֹרְסָנוּ אִם בְּכַח וּנְבוּרָה תַּחֲלֵל צֵא עִם נְדוּיֶיךָ וּנְבוּרֶיךָ אֶל הַשָּׂדֶה וּנְלַחֲמָה שָׁם וְעַתָּה הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה יוֹם חֲנוּכָּה מְרֻעָה אֲתָם נִלְחָמִים בְּמָקוֹם הַזֶּה וְהַעֲוִלָה וְאֲתָם מַחֲלִלִים אֶת יְיָ אֱלֹהֵיכֶם וְאֵת קִדְשׁוֹ וְאֵין אֲנַחְנוּ נִלְחָמִים עִם הַהִיכָל כִּי בֵּית הָאֱלֹהִים הַגְּדוֹל הוּא אֶךְ מַלְחֻמוֹתֵינוּ עִמָּכֶם וְלֹא עִם הַהִיכָל וְאֵם תֹּאמְרוּ כִּי לֹא נוּכַל לְהִלָּחֵם הַכְּנִיעוּ לָנוּ עוֹרֶף וּנְשַׂאֲתָם עָלֵינוּ וְאֵם תֹּאמְרוּ הִבֵּה וּנְלַחֲמָה הַלּוֹךְ וְנִצָּא הַשָּׂדֶה וְשָׁם נַעֲרֹךְ אֶת מַלְחֻמוֹתֵינוּ וְלִמָּה זֶה תַּשְׁבַּחוּן וּבַח עֲבוֹרַת אֱלֹהֵיכֶם . . . אֲזַ עֲנֵהוּ יוֹחָנָן שֶׁר הַפְּרִיצִים וַיֹּאמֶר אֵין לָנוּ לִזְבוּחַ זָבַח בִּקְרֵב הַהִיכָל טוֹב מִבְּשָׂרֵינוּ וּדְמֵינוּ כִּי עַל אֱלֹהֵינוּ נִמּוֹת וּנְלַחֲמָנוּ וְנַחֲשָׁב לִפְנֵינוּ כְּעוֹלַת הַחֲמִיר לְרִצּוֹן וְנִמּוֹת חַפְשִׁים בַּחוּךְ הַקֹּדֶשׁ.



the fruit of his vine and drink of the water of his own well. "And ye will live and not die, and the service of the Sanctuary of your God will not be interrupted."<sup>63</sup>

Josippon giving free rein to his imagination excels Josephus in interpreting Titus sympathetically to his Hebrew readers. The Roman general is well versed in Biblical history which his fathers taught him and which he learned from Jewish scholars, especially Josippon.<sup>64</sup> The prayers put in the mouth of Titus echo the ancient voice of Jewish prayer: "O Lord of the Universe, before whom secret things are revealed, Thou knowest the mysteries of my heart that I did not come to this city to wage war but to proclaim peace unto her". . . .<sup>65</sup>

As in *Josephus*, so in *Josippon*, Titus is absolved of responsibility for the burning of the Temple. With greater intensity, the Hebrew author describes the general's frantic efforts to stamp out the flames which the soldiers had started against his strict orders. He shouted to his soldiers to desist but in their frenzied condition and in the general tumult, they paid no heed. Drawing his sword, he shouted, upbraided and cursed his officers to stop the stampede but it was of no avail. Hoarse, weary and fatigued, he dropped to the ground in a faint. When he came to, he arose and approached the Holy of Holies which at that time had not yet been burned out. There he saw the glory and the beauty of the Sanctuary and he beheld that this was indeed the house of God and the dwelling place of the God of heaven, more glorious than the Roman or any other temples that he had ever seen.<sup>66</sup>

The tenor of the description in *Josippon* is highly significant. That Josephus should paint his patron and protector in flattering colors was to be expected; but not so in the case of the independent Hebrew writer of *Josippon* who did not hesitate to deviate from his model when his sentiments or convictions were in conflict with Josephus' views. In the eyes of the early rabbis and later generations, Titus was the enemy of God, the ruthless

<sup>63</sup> Ibid., Ch. 92, M 510.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid., Ch. 93, cf. Ch. 88 end, M 482.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid., Ch. 93.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid., Ch. 94, M 525-26.

conqueror who laid waste the sacred land, brought low the holy city, destroyed the Temple and set into motion the long, bitter exile of their people. From the third and fourth centuries onward, Titus was pictured in the Talmud as the wicked arch-enemy of the Jewish people. His name was coupled with the epithet הרשע, "the wicked." There were indeed lingering memories of Titus at the burning of the Temple but these associations were bitter and filled with hate toward Titus. Legend attributes to him vile and obscene conduct in the Holy of Holies, defilement of the Torah and the blaspheming of God. As a fitting punishment for his arrogance, God caused a tiny creature, a gnat, to enter his brain and to bring about his death.<sup>67</sup>

Not a trace of these legends or the attitude reflected in them is to be found in *Josippon*. On the contrary, in the final chapter — probably an interpolation — there is the following summation of Titus' character: "And the Emperor Titus was a great rhetorician in Greek and in Latin and he composed many learned works in these languages. And Titus was a righteous and upright man and all his judgments were just. Against his will he was compelled to bring desolation and destruction upon Jerusalem. For this great evil which was visited upon Jerusalem came about wholly because of the men of violence among the Jews and on account of their wickedness as we have related."

In another connection, various scholars have similarly pointed to the omission in *Josippon* of the Talmudic legend concerning the miracle of the cruse of oil on account of which Hanukkah is celebrated eight days. It is hardly to be assumed that the author of *Josippon* knowingly set himself in opposition to the Talmudic tradition. We must conclude therefore that this Hebrew work basically was composed before the completion of the Talmud at the end of the sixth century and probably earlier, before the contents of the Talmud and the Midrash were orally disseminated from the centers of Rabbinic study in Palestine and Babylon.

This conclusion is borne out by the religious ideas to be found in *Josippon*, which show no specific characteristics of Talmudic

<sup>67</sup> *Genesis Rabba* X: *Gittin* 56b.

thinking, even though they are closer to the general trend of Jewish thought than the corresponding passages in Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum*. The life of the soul in the hereafter is a recurrent theme in *Josippon* and also in *Josephus* and thus affords interesting multiple comparisons.

The Roman, pagan view of life after death is voiced eloquently by Josephus in the speech he ascribed to Titus.<sup>68</sup> Immortality is reserved for those who die in battle. Their souls are received into the ether and placed among the stars. They are turned into genii and heroes that reveal themselves benevolently to later generations. But they who die of disease, however pure their lives may have been, "are obliterated in subterranean night and pass into profound oblivion, their lives, their bodies, aye and their memories are brought simultaneously to a close."

Immortality along military lines found no echo in the soul of a Jew. Josephus made no distinction between the fate of a warrior and a non-combatant in the hereafter. The human being, he states, possesses a soul which is "a portion of the Deity housed in our bodies."<sup>69</sup> The bodies are composed of perishable matter but the souls are immortal and live forever. Man derives his being from God and when he dies a natural death — in contradistinction to suicide — he repays the loan which he received from God and wins "eternal renown."<sup>70</sup> The soul which remained spotless, obeying the divine laws, is allotted a holy place in heaven. In partial reward for its virtue on earth, the security of the house and family is assured. Its celestial sojourn, however, is only temporary. Its ties with an earthly existence are not altogether severed. For the soul repeatedly returns to earth to take lodgment in another human being. The transmigration of the soul is a process of progressive purification. In the revolution of the ages, the soul is granted renewed existence in a more desirable human body.<sup>71</sup>

<sup>68</sup> *B. J.* VI, 46-48.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, III, 372.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, III, 374.

<sup>71</sup> *Idem.*

These views on immortality and transmigration of the soul which Josephus



The wicked soul has its abode in the dark regions of the nether world. These regions receive those who treated God's gift of life with scorn, namely, those who took their own lives and thus cast out of their bodies the deposit which God had placed there.<sup>72</sup>

Josippon's views are expressed in the parallel chapter in language more characteristically Jewish. God, in whose power is the soul of every living creature, breathes the soul, the living spirit into the human body, causing us to live before Him. He deposits within us the living spirit and it is locked therein until in His gracious will He chooses to break the lock and release the soul. A natural death is therefore to be welcomed, for the soul then returns in peace to the heavenly sphere where it abides in the saintly company of Abraham our patriarch, and the other righteous and pious souls of our ancestors. He who dies, even prematurely, in fighting the battle of the Lord — for His covenant, His sanctuary and the Law — is covered with glory. His death is an atonement for the soul and he ascends to the Great Light and is illumined with the light of eternal life. But

expounds to his comrades in arms follow what he had previously interpreted to be the theories of the Pharisees. "Every soul, they [the Pharisees] maintain, is imperishable; but the soul of the good alone passes into another body, while the souls of the wicked suffer eternal punishment." *B. J.* II, 163.

They are only partially in accord with the teachings of the Essenes as Josephus understood them. They agree about the dual composition of the human being: the body being corruptible and transitory, the soul, immortal and imperishable. The Essene views are expressed more graphically and picturesquely. Thus we are told that the soul emanates from the finest ether. Prior to its descent into the human body it existed in an ethereal state. It was dragged down, as it were, by a sort of natural spell and became entangled in the prison-house of the body. Death sets the soul free. "Sharing the belief of the sons of Greece," writes Josephus for the benefit of his Graeco-Roman readers, "they [the Essenes] maintain that for virtuous souls there is reserved an abode beyond the ocean, a place which is not oppressed by rain or snow or heat, but is refreshed by the ever gentle breath of the west wind coming in from the ocean; while they relegate base souls to a murky and tempestuous dungeon big with never-ending punishments." *B. J.* II, 154-158. But, it is to be noted, that the theory of the transmigration of the soul was not part of the Essene theology.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, III, 375.



he who takes his own life, for whatever cause, breaks faith with the creator. He has broken the lock which God had sealed. He has violated the trust which God reposed in him when He placed the soul of life in his bodily frame. Such a person is doomed to perdition and to the nether regions of Sheol.<sup>73</sup>

Thus far the views of Josippon, although set in a different framework, are fairly analogous to the views of Josephus with one striking difference: the concept of the transmigration of the soul, which is stressed by Josephus and ascribed by him to the Pharisees, is completely disregarded in *Josippon*.<sup>74</sup>

It would appear that the Hebrew author is more concerned with the fate of the soul after death than was Josephus. He reverts to the subject more frequently and his descriptions of its heavenly abode are more graphic — at times, even spatial — and therefore cruder.<sup>75</sup> But in none of these aspects is there any distinctive trace of Talmudic influence.

As death stalks amidst the bloody scenes of murder and violence within the beleaguered city of Jerusalem, so luridly described in *Josippon*, the victims are given to long discourses on the fate of the soul. Death causes the separation of the soul from the body. It releases the soul from the bondage of the flesh. The severance of the spirit normally comes about at the natural termination of life in the divinely appointed time; the older the person, the more facile the exit of the soul. Hence the heavenly passage of the souls of the aged is accomplished in quicker time than is the case with young persons whose winged flight is slowed down by the weight of the body which is not yet prepared for severance from the soul.<sup>76</sup>

No allusion is made to the resurrection of the dead, a dogma that was already prominently featured in the Mishnah early in the third century.<sup>77</sup> The spirit is completely free of bodily

<sup>73</sup> *Josip.*, Ch. 71, M 409–13.

<sup>74</sup> See Note 71 above.

<sup>75</sup> This is especially true of the Constantinople edition and its derivatives. As usual, the Mantua version is more restrained and chaste and less picturesque.

<sup>76</sup> *Josip.*, Chs. 71, 89, 90, 93, *et passim*, M 409–10, 487–90, 498, 502.

<sup>77</sup> *Sanhed.* X, 1. A single exception may be noted in the Venice edition,

entanglement, It does not return earthward to another human frame through transmigration nor is it re-incorporated in bodily resurrection. Josippon's heroes look to eternal life in heaven as the end goal and the reward of the pure soul. This heaven, reserved for the righteous, is referred to under the Biblical name, *Gan Eden*, the Garden of Eden, but it is used only as a literary allusion denoting a state of peace. Heaven is not described by any attributes save that of light. Repeatedly the characters in *Josippon* speak of heaven as a world illumined by eternal light, the illumination emanating by implication from the supreme Source of Light. To ascend to heaven is "to walk to the Great Light and to be illumined in the light of eternal life."<sup>78</sup>

The soul retains its individual existence and character in the celestial regions. Parents are united with their children in heaven if their earthly lives are equally meritorious. The priest Amitai or Amatthus, facing death together with his three sons at the hands of the executioner exclaimed defiantly: "The murderous tyrant Simon may separate our dead bodies but he is powerless to part our souls."<sup>79</sup>

The numerous spirits dwelling in heaven are conceived of as a community of Saints. They rank according to the holiness of their lives on earth. They who ascended to heaven by way of martyrdom are especially favored. This apparently means that they are admitted closer to the circle of Israel's elect and nearer to the divine source of light and life.<sup>80</sup>

More concrete but strangely out of harmony with this vague picture of the heavenly state is the vision of Amitai, or Amatthus, the priest, in an elaborate recital. Addressing his sons who were about to be executed before his eyes, he comforts them with the assurance that as he too would be killed after them he would soon overtake them in the flight to heaven, for the souls

Ch. 90. But the passage does not occur in any of the other editions and is obviously a unique and late interpolation.

<sup>78</sup> See Note 76 above.

<sup>79</sup> *Josip.*, Ch. 89, M 487: ואם ירצה שמעון הרוצח להפריד את פגרינו לא יוכל להפריד את נשמותינו כי אחרי אשר אקבל משפטי זה על ידי שמעון האכזר בעולמי זה הגנה אבטח ולא אפחד כי חשועת ה' תהיה לנשמותי בעולם אור החיים.

<sup>80</sup> *Idem*. Cf. Ch. 71, M 409-10.

of the aged ascend more speedily to the world of light and life than the souls of young men whose flight is impeded by their steeper entanglement in corporeal matter.

"Hasten now my sons," he implored, "and seek out a lodging for us and prepare it for length of days. Would that I could precede you and make these preparations for myself and for you. . . . But now, my sons, being that you go before me, as you approach the eternal lodging-place, they who dwell there will make room for you and assign a more desirable place for you than they would for me; for while I have sinned grievously [in admitting Simon to Jerusalem] you are blameless and righteous."

Amitai reminds his sons of the fate of Hannah who in the Maccabean revolt against the Syrians yielded her seven sons to die in martyrdom for the people of God, His covenant and His Torah. They too preceded their mother in death and they prepared for themselves and their mother "a dwelling-place of light and of life with the Lord our God."

"My sons, would that you and I could share with them their lodging-place, for theirs is an honored place, as they, mother and sons, died in righteousness and saintliness. However, if we cannot rise to their height and dwell with them, we do not fall far below them and we may be their neighbors. For we too are dying in innocence for our sins and for the sake of God's Law and His covenant."<sup>81</sup>

Amitai concluded his address to his sons by telling them that in their heavenly journey they would very likely meet Jonathan, son of King Saul, who too was killed before his father, and he instructed them to relate to Jonathan all the terrible deeds of the tyrants in Jerusalem. He, Amitai, would report similarly to King Saul and to all the saintly company of martyrs who were gathered in heaven.<sup>82</sup>

Even with this peroration of Amitai, which is included in all the versions of *Josippon* (but not in *Josephus*), with or without

<sup>81</sup> Ibid., Ch. 89, M 487-90: ואם אנחנו לא נוכל להגיע למעלתם לבוא אליהם אל מלונם הנה לא נהיה שפלים מהם כי נהיה שכנים להם אשר גם אנחנו בתומתינו ובעונותינו נמות ועל תורת ה' ובריתו.

<sup>82</sup> Idem.



this fantasy — the picture of the soul in the heavenly state as portrayed in *Josippon* is bare and shows no trace of the poetic imagery and the ethical overtones of Talmudic theology. There is no glimpse of the seven heavens, the radiance of the divine presence, the ministering angels, the crowns which adorn the heads of the righteous, the ecstasy of the soul feeding upon the splendor of the divine majesty or any of the countless images in the treasure-house of Rabbinic literature. *Josippon's* celestial conceptions are not colored by the warm poetic imagination of the *aggadic* rabbis nor are they affected by the halakic views of the rabbis in their theological aspects. Viewed from any standpoint, it is clear that *Josippon* is a non-Rabbinic composition. Its range of thought and conception is indeed closer to some of the Apocryphal works than either to the Talmud or the literature of the later medieval period.<sup>83</sup>

<sup>83</sup> The book of *Josippon* ends with the fall of Masada (בית מלחמות בית), followed by an elegy in which *Josippon* mourns the destruction of Jerusalem, the burning of the Temple, the exile of the Jewish people from its land and patrimony, and concludes with the prophetic hope for the restoration of the glory of Zion, the rebuilding of the Temple, and the gathering-in of the exiles.

This moving passage is then followed by what appears as an appendix, having no connection with what preceded it. The addendum reads as follows: "Titus left a Jewish remnant in the land of Israel in Jabne, Betar and Usha and their surrounding territories with Rabban Yohanan ben Zaccai as head and prince. He also appointed Bonin, the younger brother of Joseph the Priest [*Josippon*] as ruler over the remaining Jews in Jerusalem as a tribute to his brother, Joseph the Priest. At that time, Rabban Simon, son of Gamaliel, Prince of Israel and High Priest, and Rabbi Ishmael, son of Elisha, were executed. Titus wanted to kill also Rabban Gamaliel, the father of Rabban Simon, but Rabban Yohanan ben Zaccai prevailed upon him not to do so. Rabban Yohanan ben Zaccai is he who left Jerusalem at the time when Vespasian, father of Titus, rose up against Jerusalem. The Emperor Vespasian showed him great honor and when he left for Rome, as we narrated, he commended Rabban Yohanan ben Zaccai to his son Titus requesting him to extend him high honor and station for he recognized that he was a great sage." The addendum concludes with a tribute to the character and the wisdom of Titus.

This is the only section in the book in which Rabban Yohanan ben Zaccai is mentioned. The passage is inserted out of sequence. Furthermore, the Talmudic story that Rabban Yohanan forecast the elevation of Vespasian as Caesar is not mentioned. On the other hand, *Josippon's* statement that Titus executed Rabban Simon ben Gamaliel and Rabbi Ishmael ben Elisha is not



The non-Rabbinic character of *Josippon* is furthermore illustrated in its occasional references to Jewish law. Thus, the question whether an oath is valid and binding if its fulfillment involves a breach of the divine law is discussed in terms that do not reflect any contact with the Rabbinic mode of thought or expression.<sup>84</sup> In regard to the laws governing a suicide, a strange dissimilarity is to be noted in which Josephus and

recorded anywhere in the Talmud. The execution of these sages — an apocryphal tale — is mentioned in *Semahot*, Chapter 8, but not in connection with Titus. It is interesting to note, however, that this entire passage is incorporated in toto by Abraham ibn Daud in his abbreviated version of *Josippon* entitled, *History of the Second Temple* (דברי מלכות בית שני), and is also embodied in his historical chronicle, "*Seder ha-Kabbalah*."

It is quite clear that this entire passage does not belong to the original text. Not only is it missing in the Mantua edition, but even in the Constantinople edition it appears out of context as a loose appendix added by a later scribe. It is quite possible that Abraham ibn Daud may indeed be the source of this addition. This may be inferred from the final concluding paragraph which follows immediately after the above passage. It is a midrashic commentary on Zaccariah, Chapter 11, which is also repeated in its entirety in Ibn Daud's abbreviated version. In *Josippon*, this passage again has no connection with the preceding section and is an appendix to an appendix. On the other hand, in Ibn Daud's text it follows logically and coherently after an independent section which he inserted concerning *The Ten Captivities of the Jews*. The interpretation of Zaccariah's prophecy is an appropriate sequel to this chapter, and as Ibn Daud states expressly, it rounds out the theme and vindicates the underlying thesis of his *Seder ha-Kabbalah*. אמר אברהם הלוי בן רבי דוד זכרוננו לברכה כבר זכרתי למעלה בתחלת ספר סדר הקבלה הוה שהיתה כונתנו בחבורו להודיע לתלמידי איך נמשכה קבלת תורתנו הקדושה ממשה רבינו עליו השלום... וכן מצאנו שכל הנוכח לעיל בענין מלכי בית שני כבר נבא עליו זכרי בן עדוא הנביא עליו השלום ורמזו קודם לכן בנבואתו כמו שנבאר לפנינו. וזו היא תחילת נבואתו כה אמר ה' אלהים רעה את צאן ההרנה זה בית שני....

It is comprehensible, therefore, that the late editor of the Constantinople edition, who certainly had before him Ibn Daud's abbreviated version, in this instance borrowed an extraneous passage and inserted it in *Josippon* because its sentiment harmonized with the theme of *Josippon*. By the same process, he may also have incorporated the immediately preceding passage concerning Rabban Yohanan b. Zaccai and the apocryphal story concerning Rabban Simon ben Gamaliel and Rabbi Ishmael ben Elisha.

<sup>84</sup> Ibid., Ch. 72: וכי תאמר מה נעשה על השבועה אשר נשבענו ועל הברית אשר קיימנו הלא לך לרעת כי השבועה לחטוא אשר יפירה לא יחטא כי לא יקפוץ האדם להשבע ברצון האלהים כי אם לקיים דת ומצוה וחק. ודוד אמר על ככה נשבעתי ואקיימה. ואמנם הנדר והאסר והשבועה לחלל דת ולהפר חק מצוה לא יכנו לפני ה' אלהינו This discussion is not to be found in the Mantua edition nor in the parallel chapter in *Josephus*.

*Josippon* differ from the Talmudic law as well as from each other. According to Josephus, it is a Jewish law that the body of a suicide is exposed until sunset; and, alluding to an Athenian custom, he adds that among other nations the law requires that the suicide's right hand be cut off.<sup>85</sup> *Josippon*, without referring to the first clause, asserted it was a Jewish law that if a slave committed suicide, his right hand was cut off and his body was denied burial.<sup>86</sup>

While the book of *Josippon* is non-Talmudic and its theological views and occasional references of a legal nature are not altogether in accord with Rabbinic opinion, it does not contain such legal or doctrinal matter as would arouse the ire of a strict Talmudist. Essentially, *Josippon* is history fused with pietism. The relentless historic tragedy of the fall of Jerusalem, with which the work reaches a peak and climax, its somber, brooding, emotional coloring, lighted with occasional flashes of hope and faith in the ultimate redemption, blended readily with the mood of medieval Jewry.<sup>87</sup> It became singularly popular in later generations, from the tenth century onward, when it appeared or re-appeared in versions of varying length and content. Its wealth of historic and legendary matter in the earlier part of the work, touching on the Biblical period and also the Maccabean era, was also useful to the learned scholars engaged in Bible and Talmud exegesis. Rabbinical and Biblical celebrities such as Rashi, Abraham ibn Ezra, David Kimhi, and Isaac Abravanel refer to *Josippon* as a classic authority.<sup>88</sup> A unique

<sup>85</sup> B.J. III, 377-78 (note b).

<sup>86</sup> *Josip.*, Ch. 71: והלא ידעתם אשר כי יהיה לאיש עבד בער ואיש זדון ורשע והוא סורר ומורה וקשה עורף כאשר תביאנהו עת צרה אל חסר דעת וירא כי צר לו ולא יקום לו לחשועה ילך ויחלה באילן או בזולתו ויחנק או ידקר בכלי ויסח משפט הנבל ההוא או הוא להכריח יד ימינו אשר המיחחנהו ונס משפטו לגור עליו לבלתי יקבר בקבר כי אח נפשו השחית. This passage is omitted in the Mantua edition.

<sup>87</sup> See Preface to *Josippon* by Tam b. David ibn Yahya.

<sup>88</sup> Zunz G. V. d. J. cites the following references to *Josippon* by Rashi: II Kings 20.13; Ezek. 27.17; Daniel 5, 1; 6, 29; 7, 6; 8.11; 21, 22; 11, 2, 17; Berak. 43a; Yoma 23a; Baba Batra 3b. Zunz also cites single references by R. Gershom, in the *Aruk* of R. Nathan, Ibn Ezra's Commentary (Psalms 120,5), Judah Hadassi's Commentary (I Chronicles 11.17) and R. Isaac b. Samuel (*Tosafot*, *Aboda Zara* 10b). To these may be added David Kimhi, *Sefer ha-Sharashim* s. v. משך; and Isaac Abravanel who quotes *Josippon* frequently. The following references, drawn from his Commentary on Genesis

work, it exerted fascination upon the learned and unlearned alike.

Thus, a strange metamorphosis came about. The historic Josephus was displaced by an unknown Hebrew author under the guise of Josippon, who readily found his way into the hearts of his people. Whereas Josephus, neglected or rejected by the Jews, was welcomed into the bosom of the Church, the pseudo-Josephus received the adulation of his people as patriot and hero, as a sage and a man of God. Fantastic as it must seem to the modern reader, the eulogy of an early editor of the fourteenth century faithfully expressed the appraisal of many generations: "Joseph b. Gorion, man of God; mighty warrior; anointed for battle; priest to the Supreme God."

alone, indicates his customary usage of *Josippon*: Part I, 20a, 24a, 25a, 26d, 27a; Part II, 29a, 29b, 30b; Ed. Warsaw, 1862: He refers to Joseph b. Gorion's writings in general (I, 20a, II, 29a, and also under specific titles: *Book of Antiquities* ס' הקדמונים or ס' הקדמוניות (I 24a, 25a); *Book of the Wars of the Second Temple* ס' מלחמת בית שני (II, 30b) and in one instance (I 26d-27a) to Book II wherein he evidently followed the classification of the Constantinople edition. The passage alluded to is to be found in Book II, Ch. 11. Cf. above p. 640. See also *Mashmia Yeshua* (Offenbach, 1767) 23c, 94d. Abraham Zacuto frequently referred to *Josippon* in his *Sefer Yuhasin*: (ed. Filipowski, 8a, 13a, 24b, 83a, 202b, 231b, 244b, *et passim*). He regarded *Josippon* as an authoritative source. Note especially 244b: but at times he was also sharply critical, 231b.

Zacuto used Josephus' *Antiquities* as well as *Josippon* but referred to both under the latter name. Thus on p. 8a, Zacuto cited a Talmudic statement that Saul and Samuel died in the same year, which, said Zacuto, contradicted the statement of Joseph b. Gorion, who said that Saul reigned for twenty years, eighteen years during Samuel's lifetime and two years thereafter. Zacuto's reference in this instance is not to *Josippon*, which does not treat of the life of Saul, but to *Ant. VI, 378*. Zacuto had before him the Latin translation which has the correct reading, eighteen years during the lifetime of Samuel and two years after the latter's death. The Greek version, which reads twenty-two years after Samuel's death, thus raising the reign of Saul to forty years, is obviously a doctored emendation by a pious Christian scribe so as to reconcile Josephus with Acts 13.21, where Saul's reign is given as forty years. See Marcus' note f to *Ant. VI, 378*. See also *Ant. X, 143*.

It is surprising that Zacuto attributed the *Antiquities* and *Josippon* to the same author. See above n. 13

A045122.1  
THEOLOGY LIBRARY  
CLAREMONT, CALIF.